

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

It would be possible to write a very dull book on *The Attributes of God*. The thing has been done before, and in all probability it will be done again. But it would not be possible for Dr. FARNELL. He knows too much about the concrete facts of the great historical religions to write about religion otherwise than interestingly. His Gifford Lectures on 'Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality,' delivered in St. Andrews in 1920, and his five elaborate volumes on 'The Cults of the Greek States,' show that, at any rate of Greek religion, there is nothing that can be known that he does not know.

---

It is therefore with a mind filled with facts that he approaches his discussion of *The Attributes of God* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net)—the subject he chose for his second series of Gifford Lectures. 'The view maintained throughout this course,' he tells us in the last lecture, 'has been mainly historical rather than philosophical or dogmatic, being chiefly fixed upon the phenomena of the living and working religions.' Many of Dr. FARNELL's arguments and criticisms show that he might, had he pleased, have dealt with his subject philosophically, but most readers will be grateful that he has elected to present the great religious ideas which he discusses as they operate within religious life. This method clothes the discussion from beginning to end with warmth and vitality.

The very titles of his chapters prepare us for a discussion which will not be theological in the narrower sense of that word. While there are chapters on the Moral Attributes of God, on the Metaphysical Attributes, and on the Attribute of Power, there are others on the Attributes of Beauty, Wisdom, and Truth, on the Political Attributes, and on Tribal and National Attributes which carry us, by the very names they bear, beyond the region of abstract discussion into the warm and eager life of men.

---

Not the least conspicuous feature of the argument is its generosity. He believes, with another Gifford Lecturer, that 'it is at the least probable that all of the ideas about God have had some value' (Professor W. P. Paterson, *The Nature of Religion*, p. 380); only we imagine that he would express himself even more confidently. Take, for example, his kindly treatment of polytheism. While he frankly exposes its dangers, not the least of which was its inevitable introduction of the sex-element, with its influence not only upon mythology, but sometimes also on cultic practice, he urges that it contributed to the development of art, that it produced a religious tolerance which is usually conspicuously absent from the great monotheistic religions, and that it encouraged a certain *joie de vivre*, which has too seldom accompanied the austerities of monotheism.



Another interesting aspect of the discussion is the revelation it brings, at not a few points, of the curious permanence in modern religion—albeit in transformed guise—of ancient ideas whose superstitious origins are not recognized by one worshipper in a hundred thousand. As he well says, ‘the liturgy of a great historic Church is the mirror of many ages.’ The Communion-table, for example, has gathered to itself the immemorial sanctity of the ancient altar as charged with the real presence, and this idea ‘is not aware of its kinship with the crude conceptions of the old world concerning a finite god.’ Similarly a dead ritual is quickened with new intention, for example, in the Church-service of the churching of women, ‘which was suggested by the primitive feeling of the impurity of child-birth, but has been transformed into an act of thanksgiving.’

---

These skilful transformations notwithstanding, Dr. FARNELL occasionally hints that the expression of modern religious faith should be in franker consonance with the demands of the modern religious mind. For example, he argues that our liturgy ‘stands in urgent need of revision in respect of the objects for which we think it legitimate to proffer prayer: we do not pray for alterations in the tides or the movements of the planets; but we show ourselves on the primitive level of knowledge and religion when we pray for or against rain, as though the weather, being variable, obeyed no law but depended on the caprice or temper of an emotional deity.’

---

Similarly he offers criticisms, at once searching and refreshing, of religious creed and practice. In discussing monotheism and the difficulty it encountered in the attempt to combine consistently ‘the divine man, near and most dear, attractive and appealing,’ with the form of the supreme God, he bluntly maintains that the Athanasian formulæ have been of no avail to fuse these two distinct forms into one. And he is certainly well within the truth when he asserts that in spite of our hymnology there is little proof that the personality of the third

Person of our Trinity is a living power for the mass of believers. More startlingly still, but with equal justice, he remarks that the current popular religion of Europe, so far from being a pure monotheism, should rather be described as ‘a high spiritual polytheism tempered and restrained by the Athanasian creed.’ And he punctures the pride of the theologians—if there be such a creature to-day as a proud theologian—by reminding them that a critical review of the efforts of the ages to reconcile the evil in the world of men and the world of Nature with the infinite power and the infinite love of God must pronounce that no such reconciliation has been found.

---

At many points in the discussion we are reminded how deep is the debt of the present to the often very distant past, not only for its religious ideas, but also for its not seldom imperfectly apprehended phraseology. We speak, glibly or reverently as the case may be, of the Name of God and the Word of God, without realizing how charged with magic potency these simple phrases once were. Whether or not any Biblical writer ever consciously attached to these phrases such associations, at any rate ‘in tracing out the origin of the Biblical usage we must reckon with Babylon and the magical hypothesis.’

---

Dr. FARNELL never touches the Bible without saying something to which we must give heed, whether we agree with him or not. We agree that in the Old Testament we have the foundations of the first philosophy of history. Not all perhaps would agree with every clause of the statement that Jahweh ‘has no discoverable nature-origin and none of the weaknesses of a nature-god, but is an ethical personality to the core and from the beginning,’ though that is nobly said. Still more might demur to the description of the Hebraic and Christian God as aloof from the immediate world of Nature around us: this cannot be very justly said of the God of Gn 1, Is 40, Job 38f., Ps 104, or of the God of Jesus who so loved the birds and the flowers.

---

His view of history is both challenging and



bracing. The deeper, he says, is a man's moral reading of history, the more impossible the doctrine becomes for him that the drama of history is God's work. 'We cannot say that human history represents God's purpose; for human history is the drama of human agents acting freely,' and reason and imagination would alike stagger at the thought that God was responsible for such a horror as the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, or for the War which recently convulsed the world. It is by the exercise of his free will, which he may use for evil as for good, that man regresses or advances, and 'progress means strenuous willing.' But 'to maintain this is by no means to rule out the idea of divine action in human affairs on a large scale.' Dr. FARNELL shares the faith, Homeric no less than Christian, in the Divine care for the human community.

---

There is a time for everything under the sun, said the Preacher, or, at any rate, words to that effect. And one application of his words must occur to every thoughtful observer who looks out upon the human drama. He sees everywhere in the world of thought, springing up spontaneously in different countries, one and the same tendency or drift or movement. It was remarkable, for example, how the same attitude to the problems of philosophy appeared simultaneously in three countries, in America taking the name of Pragmatism, in England of Humanism, and in Germany of Ritschlianism. It was the same movement, and it was an independent movement in each land. That is only one example of what is seen continually in age after age.

---

It may seem a descent from the exalted region of philosophy to offer as another example the movement for Church union. But it is not a descent. For this is not a mere ecclesiastical question, or one of expediency or politics. It is essentially a religious question and deeply concerns the interests of the Kingdom of God. And one of the most powerful reasons for pursuing the matter to a conclusion is

just the fact to which allusion has been made, that it is obviously a duty to which the Mysterious Providence that guides the course of thought and actions is imperiously pointing.

---

There is a time for separation. There are crises when the plain duty of a body of men with life-and-death convictions is to come out of a Church which denies or nullifies these convictions. An instance is the Reformation. Whether the Reformed Church was right or wrong (that does not concern us now) the reformers believed their faith was vital to the interests of truth and religion and they were bound to come out. Another plain instance is to be found in the various secessions from the Church of Scotland. The Disruption worthies may have contended for a truth or for a chimæra, but at any rate, believing what they did, that the liberty of the Church was at stake, they had to separate. That was an era of separation, and each secession may be truly said to have enriched the religious life of the land.

---

But we have passed away from that era. What the secessions fought for has been gained. And we have now come to an age when the movement all over the world is for union. As patently as the previous age was one for dividing, is the present age one for closing up divisions. And accordingly we see everywhere, in England, in Scotland, in America, in Canada, the same movement springing up and the same irresistible impulse driving men to come together. When one looks at the matter thus, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the movement is under the care of the Divine Spirit and will inevitably issue in success.

---

That seems to us one sound reason why humble Christian men should feel the obligation to unite and to pursue ways of uniting. But there are other reasons. Professor SHAW, of Halifax in Canada, has published lately an address entitled *A Scottish Presbyterian and Church Union in Canada*, in which he gives his reasons for adhesion to the union movement there. It is a powerful plea,



and its main contention is an impressive one. It is this. The Church is the Living Body of a Living Redeemer, and it cannot be shackled by the chains of the past. The Church has always held herself free to change the forms of her faith or the forms of its expression, and also to review her organization and adapt it to changing conditions. This is the answer to those who resist union on the ground that it is likely to alter the face of the Church. The Church is not unchangeable unless in its faith in an unchanging Redeemer. It has to learn. It has to adapt itself. It has to meet the needs of every generation. And to do this to-day it must read the mind of a Providence which points to one over-mastering service.

---

One of the objections to union which is most influential is that we are being asked to give up what we have contended for in the past. But this often amounts simply to an adhesion to old watch-words which have ceased to have the old meaning. In Scotland, for example, there has been a traditional objection to a 'civil establishment' of religion, and the present union movement is resisted on that ground. But in the new constitution of the Church of Scotland 'establishment' has ceased to have any objectionable meaning. All that was dangerous to liberty in the old *thing* has been removed, but still the objectors fasten on the old *word*, which is now without any fatal significance. That is one instance of the way in which words that once had a content that was to many evil are still treated as shibboleths or fetishes when the content has departed from them. Without offence to any one, perhaps the same may be said of 'Episcopacy,' which once stood to many for an invasion of spiritual liberty but which has no such significance now for anybody.

---

But there are other considerations leading strongly to the obligation of outward unity as well as inward. There is the call for a united witness. You may sneer at the men of the world, but this is a pragmatic age, and the world is engaged in sneering at the Churches because they cannot agree in regard

to essential things. We fail to impress the world because the world says to us, 'You are unable to come together and look at the big things: you lay stress on secondary matters. Your minds are full of the petty things which divide you, and you have not the largeness of mind to look steadily at the great things which should be everything to you. If you had the mind to see what is really big these things which separate you would seem trivial.' Can the Churches afford to despise an indictment like that?

---

There is another and practical consideration. To-day the Church has to meet enemies that are more powerful than ever before. Not intellectual enemies, but forces that wish to nullify her witness and undermine her influence, and there is a need, and a call, for a fresh organization of her resources to meet the modern situation and the modern enemy. It is not merely a question of economy, though that is of real moment. It is the old question of unity of command. It was unity of command that won the War for us. The victory came when all forces were brought together and were thrown where they were needed. Is not that the precise situation in the religious world to-day? How can we win the greater war when we are all fighting just as we like on a broad front with no cohesion and no unity of organized plan?

---

In no sphere have Christian missions encountered more opposition and difficulty than in the Moslem world. Islam has hitherto been as a dead wall, immovable, impenetrable. Ever since the time of the Crusades it has seemed to present a solid front to Christendom, and has kept alive the fear that at any hour it might unite all its forces in a holy war. There is ample evidence that the British Government in its handling of Mohammedan problems has for many years been obsessed by this fear, and our Moslem fellow-subjects in India have known well how to play upon it. Converts from Islam have been few in number, and the tendency has been to direct missionary effort to other and more hopeful



fields. There occurred, however, in March 1924, one of the most dramatic events in history, namely, the abolition of the Caliphate by the Republic of Turkey and the expulsion of the Caliph and his family from Constantinople. It came as a thunder-clap, and its echoes are still reverberating throughout the world of Islam. If Mussolini were suddenly to turn the Pope and his cardinals out of Rome bag and baggage it would not cause a greater commotion in the papal world. The Caliph has ever been regarded not only as the spiritual head but as the defender of the faith of Islam. In his name the faithful offered their prayers in every mosque, and his deposition seemed like dislodging the keystone of the whole structure. It was an event which could not fail to rouse world-wide interest, and it has revealed to many, as by a lightning flash, the mighty changes that have in recent years been passing over the Near East.

---

Any one desiring information upon this most important subject cannot do better than turn to a book just published on *The Moslem World of To-day*, edited by Dr. John R. MOTT (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). The twenty-three papers which constitute this volume of composite authorship present with real comprehension and living interest many of the more important aspects of the Moslem world of to-day and describe the causes underlying the tremendous changes which have taken place in Islam in recent years. They show convincingly why this situation is one of urgent interest and concern to all Christendom. They are the outcome of a series of conferences which have been held in various parts of the Moslem world, culminating in a General Conference in Jerusalem in April 1924. Their object is to provide an up-to-date survey of the conditions, intellectual, social, moral, and religious, in Moslem lands, and to co-ordinate the experience, thinking, and vision of missionary workers.

---

Briefly the facts are these. The Caliphate has been swept away before the rising tide of democracy and progress. Its continuance was found to be

incompatible with the spirit of the age and with reform. So it had to go. Nothing could more strikingly illustrate how profoundly the East has felt the impact of the West, and how the most sacred and venerable institutions have been shaken to their foundations by the War. A new spirit of nationalism has taken the place of the old ideal of Pan-Islamism. The Turk, the Egyptian, the Arab is a national first, a Moslem second. The possibility of a Holy War has receded below the horizon. Turks will be found saying that their nation made its biggest mistake when it adopted Islam. Evidences of revolution in the intellectual and social life of the peoples of the Near East are manifold. The railway, and still more the motor car and the aeroplane, have penetrated to the remotest corners. The cinema is a revolution in itself. A thirst for education has been awakened, and an amazing number of newspapers has sprung to life. 'Fleet Street may well envy the young Afghan editors,' said the *Times* in a notice of the Afghan Press, 'it is the golden age of journalism when a nation is beginning to think, and truth is as fresh as dew, and there is no bugbear of banality.' The supreme evidence of revolution in the East is the awakening of its womanhood, so long secluded and despised. In Stamboul itself seven in eight of the Moslem women may be seen walking unveiled in the streets.

---

These changes would seem to present to the Christian Church a unique opportunity. It is easy, of course, to exaggerate the crisis and to raise the cry of 'now or never.' Nations are neither born nor reborn in a day. But, when all allowance is made, the fact remains that there is a new readiness to hear the Gospel, though it may only arise from inquisitiveness. A daily paper in Constantinople recently conducted a discussion for seven months on the Personality of Christ. The press often speaks in terms of the highest praise of Jesus Christ. Here is part of a noble tribute which appeared as a leading article in *Al Iraq*, Bagdad, on Christmas Day, 1921. 'Nineteen hundred and twenty-one years ago the ray that leads to the right path appeared in Bethlehem as a bright star, and His



light spread over the East and the West. On that day was born the Image of Love and the Great Child. He spent His days calling people to the Truth and guiding them to the right path. He was a good shepherd who sheltered His sheep and defended them against the wolves. . . . The greatness of Cæsar has passed away, the Nero's page in history is a dark one ; but time has failed to efface the greatness of the Apostle of Love, and His page in history remains white, with no spots on it.' On the other hand a great deal of the anti-Christian material produced in the West is being eagerly assimilated and skilfully used to attack the work of the Christian missionaries in the East.

The problem before the Christian Church is to turn this Renaissance into a Reformation. The situation in Moslem lands to-day presents an interesting parallel to the fifteenth century in Western Europe. The moulds which had contained and shaped the life of the Middle Ages were all broken up as new worlds swam into view. But only in those nations where the new spirit was directed into religious channels were the deepest springs of national life rejuvenated. The nations which rejected or crushed the religious movement, like Italy, Spain, and Portugal, were spiritually and morally, and soon, also, politically crippled. The wonderful flower of their springtime did not yield fruit because it lacked the spiritual vitality of the Protestant Reformation. So the Moslem world to-day needs to be vitalized by the Gospel if its awakening is to herald the coming of a better day. The old Mohammedanism is passing away,

and many of its devotees, shaken out of that ancient stronghold, are taking the road of secularism. The issue is not Mohammed or Christ. It is Christ or decay and death. Here as in the case of the ethnic religions it is becoming apparent that upon the Christian faith there will ultimately fall the whole burden of keeping alive religion in the earth.

What forces are available for the winning of the Moslem world? The Churches of the East are, locally, in the front trenches, but they are so dispirited, darkened, and hardened by long oppression that little is meantime to be hoped from them. 'The really central question is: Has a missionary Protestantism vital power and spiritual energy enough to flood the spiritual deserts of modern Islam with the rising tide of a spiritual revival which will lead to a religious reformation and transformation?' The hour calls for a great Crusade. The Christianity of the West must approach the Moslem world with fullest sympathy and in the spirit of brotherhood, bearing in her hand a full Gospel in the assurance that it will meet the Moslem need. The workers already in the field have been confirmed in this assurance. 'The most searching experience and possibly the most creative hour in each of the conferences was the consideration of the topic, "What has Christ to bring to Moslems which they cannot under any circumstances obtain from their own religion or from any other source?"' The corporate thinking and intercession of those memorable hours confirmed the faith of every one as to the absolute uniqueness, supremacy, and sufficiency of Jesus Christ the Living Lord.'

## Recent Thought on the Doctrine of the Atonement.

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT MACKINTOSH, D.D., LECTURER IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

I PROPOSE to confine this report to literature in our own language. Before we attempt any historical statement, let us briefly consider the nature of the problem as a *locus* in systematic or dogmatic thought.

I. Two great doctrines have, in a sense, competed for attention from orthodox minds, alike in past ages and in our own day: the Incarnation and the Atonement. Mr. J. K. Mozley has remarked upon the comparative waning of what we may call the



Westcott and *Lux Mundi* tradition, which explicitly defined Christianity as 'the religion of the Incarnation,' and upon the continuous stream of recent books, Anglican and other, which deal with that other doctrine termed in his own volume of collected pieces 'the Heart of the Gospel.' Of course we must not exaggerate the divergence here implied. Orthodoxy proclaims the truth of both doctrines. The difference between the rival schools or tendencies is concerned with nothing beyond comparative emphasis. Unless, subconsciously, more is at stake? The Western world inherited Nicene and post-Nicene Christology as a simple presupposition, when it began to deal with its own more ethically conceived problems. A pre-Christian dogmatic postulate, that Messiah must be the Son of David, had safeguarded in the East the assertion of Christ's humanity; which else, perhaps, might have been volatilized away. Only in strangely indirect fashion ('what is not assumed is not healed') did the humanity of Christ reveal its religious significance to the Greek Fathers. Latin thought, from very early days, struck a different note (*In quantum homo*,<sup>1</sup> *mediator*). It is not certain that what is inherited as a simple presupposition will permanently maintain itself as the best way of formulating the religious interests at stake; and we cannot omit from our survey in this article efforts to argue back from 'modern' views of the Atonement to a modern and non-Orthodox Christology. I may be permitted to quote my own remark,<sup>2</sup> that Ernest Troeltsch dismisses to limbo both versions of orthodoxy. In whatever sense that powerful mind continued Christian, neither Atonement nor Incarnation meant anything to him.

We may define doctrinal Christianity as the assertion that Christ is *necessary* and that Christ is *all-sufficient*. He comes doubtless not in His own name but in His Father's; nevertheless, our thesis, reasonably understood, is nothing less than what we have termed it—the central utterance of Christian belief. The doctrine of the Atonement proclaims, in addition, the necessity of the *death* of Christ and the all-sufficiency, if not of the death as such, yet of the completed Work. Not truly of the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Franks points out that Lutheranism felt it necessary to modify this position, though taken directly from 1 Ti 2<sup>5</sup>. According to the Lutheran system, Christ is Mediator in both His natures—human and divine.

<sup>2</sup> 'Troeltsch and his English Interpreters,' in *Congregational Quarterly*, July 1924.

death apart from resurrection; nor yet of death apart from that life, full of grace and truth, which such a death and such a rising from the dead worthily or inevitably crowned; but none the less our doctrine proclaims the all-sufficiency of one sacrifice for sins offered for ever. Something came to pass in Christ's death, apart from which God had not been duly glorified nor man redeemed. There may be erratic Christians, like Ritschl and even Herrmann, who find Christ necessary as revelation—'we by Him do believe in God'—i.e. as the *sole* saving revelation,<sup>3</sup> but who have nothing helpful to tell us regarding the death of our Lord. Yet 'placarded' before us stands, and must stand for ever, the challenging Fact. And if with perverse ingenuity, some one asks, What, then, if His enemies had *not* crucified Him?—it is enough for us to reply that by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God He had been given into their hands. Something came to pass—something 'objective,' as Mr. Mozley once more expresses it. For my own part, I seek rather a truth which blends the objective and the subjective. What Kant has taught us in pure philosophy may surely prove to be the part of wisdom in Christian theology as well. A dear friend of my own was grievously wounded, when a glib young pupil said to him, 'But God, sir, is *my attitude*.' What may be said offensively has also been said, I take it, with the deepest impressiveness: 'To know God, you must love Him.' If Christ is not 'my Lord,' what is all the objective truth about Him worth to me? And on the other hand, if Christ is not more than a helpful human influence, what have I, what has any man, to rely upon? Because He is necessary, Christ can never be for us anything that does not include the richest subjective meaning. And, because He is all-sufficient, Christ is the supreme objective reality, and we are built upon eternal foundations in the Rock of Ages. The average barely subjective theory may reduce the grace of God to a fragment of psychological process. We have not so learned Christ.

II. A few years back, a noticeable group of theological books appeared, dealing with the history of the doctrine of the Atonement. Earliest in time came the two-volume *History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ*, by Principal Franks of Western College, Bristol. Massive in learning and masterly in power, this study never fails to handle

<sup>3</sup> Troeltsch's Christian confession is infinitely more precarious.



its great theme broadly, so as to bring out the bearing of doctrines of the Atonement upon the whole structure of theological systems. And, while sympathetic towards what is good in all types of doctrine, Dr. Franks is definitely Protestant and evangelical. Yet he is reticent regarding the details of his personal belief; and the four 'syntheses' in which he sums up the movement of Christian thought are not easy reading. Perhaps we may take it that he views Ritschl as the high-water mark in the progress of doctrine—a view not specially easy to justify when the doctrine of the Atonement is being made central. Dean Rashdall's posthumously published Bampton Lectures are equally learned and decidedly more outspoken. But, when he has said all, how little do we find in our possession! Like the father of Deism,<sup>1</sup> he believes that 'we should repent of our sins,' and that if we do 'God will forgive us.' Neither Gethsemane nor Calvary seems to add one single touch to this correct yet meagre piece of insight. Is 53 when scientifically expounded is no Messianic prediction, and therefore—according to Rashdall—its spiritual relevance to the death of Christ is *nil*. This kind of theology is Abelardism run to seed, and moral 'influence' theory at about its feeblest.

Mr. J. K. Mozley's *Doctrine of the Atonement*, one of the strongest of Messrs. Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology,' is mainly historical, though it sums up cautiously in favour of objective and almost (though not quite) penal readings of the doctrine. Two other volumes owed their simultaneous appearance to the choice of a 'special doctrine' for historical study during several years by the Manchester University Theological Faculty. One book was by Mr. Grensted, recently Principal of Egerton Hall in Manchester, now returned to the University of Oxford; the other was by myself. Mr. Grensted's supply of material is excellently useful; he quotes original texts, and appends an English translation. His own expressed attachment is to R. C. Moberly's version of the doctrine of Vicarious Penitence in Christ; I have thought that I could detect something too much of an attempt to impose not precisely that doctrine but generally the feelings and beliefs of a cultured modern Anglican upon the great figures of the past—Could they not mean a little less than they now seemed to say? And here again, perhaps, a little

<sup>1</sup> According to Dr. Franks, this was a Christian touch in Lord Herbert.

more? My own less learned review of *Historic Theories* of the doctrine<sup>2</sup> may be open to the criticism that I sharpen unduly the utterances which others soften. Yet I venture to hope that any one who gives fair consideration to the review of the great theories, and to the lessons which that review suggests, will find himself helped in appraising past history, and even—it may be—in undertaking the real task of the present; to state a theology which is truly ethical and unflinching Christian. In a brief closing chapter of attempted construction, my book directed attention mainly to Christ's work, in living and in dying, as the Redeemer of human character—a doctrine more familiar (even from Dr. Porcher du Bose) in the bizarre form of what has been termed Redemption by Sample, according to which Christ took into His person our sin-stained human nature and washed it clean.

Earlier than this group of historical efforts, we had the work of at least two notable systematic thinkers, both of whom started from within the orthodox and even the penal tradition—Dr. Forsyth and Dr. Denney. One had thought that Dr. Denney, at least, was absolutely identified with a penal interpretation of the sufferings of Christ; but midway in his career he disclaimed the thought of transferred punishment; and, in his posthumous Cunningham Lectures on the *Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, he reveals to us a finely ripened and sympathetic mind. Forsyth's case was not dissimilar. Unfortunately the precise doctrine commended to us by either remained more than a little obscure. On the other side, as representing distinctive Abelardism, nothing of equal weight, I should suppose, was given to us in recent years; or nothing before Dr. Rashdall's lectures.

III. Within a period that may be reckoned rather by months than by years, books on our subject have continued to pour forth—some larger, some smaller, most of them Abelardian. It has been the present writer's duty to notice in one or other theological organ six recent studies—Anglican (Canon Storr's *Problem of the Cross* and Dr. Maynard Smith's *Atonement*), Congregationalist (Professor

<sup>2</sup> In a perfectly friendly notice of my book, Mr. Mozley described me as a 'free lance'—hardly to my contentment. Evangelical Christians hate legalism, yet seek always to be 'not without law to God, but under law to Christ.' Still, that does not exactly imply that we are under law to the Ecumenical Councils; and the kindest of Anglo-Catholics may find the distinction subtle.



C. J. Cadoux's *Message about the Cross* and his brother Dr. A. T. Cadoux's *The Gospel that Jesus Preached*), Wesleyan (Dr. Maldwyn Hughes' *What is the Atonement?*), and Presbyterian (Dr. G. H. Morrison's *Significance of the Cross*—a rather unusually printed reproduction, in outline, of some powerful sermons). To these I should wish to add Mr. Mozley's *Heart of the Gospel*, already mentioned, but now requiring fuller reference.

All six volumes illustrate the continued tendency to dwell more upon Atonement as such than (at least *eo nomine*) upon Incarnation. Again, we may search all the six without finding any clear reference to the impressive theory of Vicarious Repentance, whether as developed on the lines of church, sacrament, and penitential sorrow by Dr. R. C. Moberly, or as propounded a generation earlier, with an even nobler earnestness joined to radiant serenity of spirit, by John M'Leod Campbell. So, too, we miss any attempt to find the significance of the atoning work of Jesus Christ in its subjective effects<sup>1</sup> not on human emotion merely, but on the character and the conscience—with or without the bizarrerie of Redemption by Sample. Any who have tried to expound the mystery of the Atonement as the necessary means for the renewal of man's soul must admit to themselves that, so far as the contemporary mind is concerned, we have pleaded in vain.

Concentrating our attention now upon the four volumes that were named at the head of our list—that modern evangelical, Dr. Storr, is at least far less objective in his recent utterance than Mr. Mozley had judged his earlier writings to be; while Dr. Maynard, with all his Anglo-Catholic extremeness, has been described to me by an expert belonging to his own communion as having formulated nothing beyond Moral Influence, and yet having credited himself with reproducing fully the traditional more objective faith of the Church. The remaining three studies—those of the two Doctors Cadoux, and of Dr. Maldwyn Hughes—stand, with differences in detail, for a combination of Moral Influence with the modern theory of Divine Suffering or the Eternal Cross. The former element in this credo received its noblest statement from Abelard, but is found in full power wherever evangelism is

really alive, and goes back through Augustine to St. Paul, '*God commendeth his love towards us in that Christ died for us.*' A precious, a sacred, a heart-moving element in the truth of God, but (as all defenders of the objective doctrine must maintain) incomplete in itself, and owing its strange power to our apprehension of that greatest among objective facts, that '*when we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.*' The other thought, so far as I am aware, first emerged from the fertile mind of Horace Bushnell. We may gladly join with Bushnell and his disciples in getting rid of the prejudice intruded upon Christian thought by Greek philosophy—that the deity as such must be 'impassible.' But can we seriously hold that, on the balance, the blessed God is reduced to habitual unhappiness by man's sin? or that, if that lamentable belief were correct, God's unhappiness could redeem man? There is no real objectivity here; only the sentimental 'influence' of a foolish fancy.

Dr. A. T. Cadoux travels on from the special doctrine of Atonement into wider regions of Christian theology. He is resolutely anti-miraculous, and his Christology is narrowly humanitarian. Both of these startling positions are presented to us as distinct religious improvements, loyal to the inner spirit of Christianity. One has sometimes suspected that Harnack's views on Christology are not dissimilar. Harnack definitely stands by Athanasius as against Arius; for he finds it necessary to assure himself that we are in touch, not with any high-placed Being subordinate to the true God, but with the Father of mercies Himself. Yet, perhaps, in Christ *the man* Harnack discovers that full access to the heart of God which Luther preached with such melting tenderness, and which Arius's Creature-Logos would have made eternally impossible. It appears therefore that, upon the outskirts of subjective theories regarding Atonement, more formidable problems still are beginning to loom into view.

If we pass now to the other side of the debate, we find in Dr. Morrison confessedly a champion of Denney's views, and in Mr. Mozley, largely, a prophet of Dr. Forsyth's. There is a certain amount of overlapping in the several papers which make up Mr. Mozley's recent volume; and the present writer must confess that, on a first reading, he thought the papers unequal in value and the volume as a whole slight. A re-perusal, undertaken for the purpose of this article, has proved much

<sup>1</sup> The *Dogmatic* of the German theologian Haering is worth consulting on this point—namely, on the objectivity truly implied in the subjective working of the grace of Christ—and also for its statement in modified form of the theory of Vicarious Penitence.



more impressive. If one may say so, Mr. Mozley worthily represents in our own generation a name already so distinguished. And it is a picturesque circumstance that one, whose interests and associations are now so largely Anglo-Catholic, should dedicate his collected papers partly to the memory of Dr. Forsyth, if partly to a living friend, Mr. Studdert-Kennedy. Both in speaking for himself and in summarizing Forsyth, Mr. Mozley pushes his way back from Atonement to Incarnation—to the veritable full literal truth of Ph 2<sup>5-11</sup>. Forsyth's assertion, that in the death of Christ God 'judges sin,' may be almost verbally Pauline, but it is very hard to put a definite meaning upon it; and, when Mr. Mozley seeks to explain it, he seems to pass out of the region of logic into that of rhetoric—rhetoric which, however fine in spirit and however worthy in form, is not what one was seeking. Even stranger is Forsyth's decision, sympathetically conveyed to us by the younger man: It was necessary that Christ Jesus, however tempted, should be impeccable; it was necessary that Christ Jesus, under conditions of Kenosis, should not know that He was impeccable! One must have strange confidence, both in one's moral intuitions and in one's powers of ratiocination, to speak thus. I will say no more regarding Christology; but I must admit, with full emphasis, the value of sacraments to Mr. Mozley's faith. Need that value be a thing confined to Catholic High Churchmen? Every time we break the bread and share the cup, it is as though God Himself were saying to us—Christ is more needful to you than food, or light, or air; Christ is utterly sufficient to cleanse and to bless you; Christ who is all this, waits upon you now. . . . Sacramental doctrine, even in the form he gives to it, does not hinder but gloriously helps Mr. Mozley's faith. But was there ever an Anglo-Catholic like him? Or will there ever be such another? Or is there anything in Anglo-Catholic doctrine itself to prevent the superstitious from regarding the Eucharist as magic, or to prevent the self-righteous from regarding it as one more good work which will extort the favour of God?

So, too, Dr. Morrison, when he writes 'Christ is more than a man; He is Man,' is exploiting the old Greek dogma—of the An- or Enhypostasy of Christ's human nature—in a new interest. The Eastern mind affirmed it in order to safeguard, if possible, the unity of the theanthropic person; Dr. Morrison repeats it in order to make reasonable and

credible—if it might serve so great an end—our faith that this one man is the Saviour and hope of all the ends of the earth. Happy are they who can carry the burden of old forms lightly, or even find their yoke a help towards true spiritual freedom. But not all are so fortunate as that. And, for us who are non-'Catholic' (in the sense in which Catholicism is a sectarian badge), there is always theoretical possibility of a better restatement of the creeds. And what is abstractly possible may one day reveal itself as practicable and so forthwith become a duty. Not for us are the hindrances, nor yet the helps, found in these ancient trammels by Christians who accept them as eternal truth.

IV. We do not fully estimate the currents of contemporary thought until we have asked not only what is published, but also how it is received. Let me quote a single sentence from what has been said of Mr. Mozley's *Heart of the Gospel* over the initials of a well-known theological Professor in the University of Cambridge: 'Any one who is satisfied to regard "the course of the world's history" <sup>1</sup> in the pessimistic or world-denying manner that has been common in the Church in the past, or the gospel as "a gospel for a perishing world" [p. 163], may be more than content with Mr. Mozley's championship of the position. Others, of whom I am one, would not admit the main premiss.' <sup>2</sup> Mr. Mozley wrote 'perishing,' he did not say 'a lost world.' In vain! His moderation does not save him. His critic's meaning is made more articulate in the closing words of an article in the *Modern Churchman*:<sup>3</sup> 'Jesus Himself may be far less regarded to-day as the Saviour of mankind, because none of the doctrines of the Fall of Man and Atonement and Heaven and Hell, which are generally known as Christian, are credible to-day. But His ideas and ideals as to the relations that ought to exist between man and man as a condition of human society are becoming socially effective as they never were while those doctrines reigned and the world was regarded as a perishing world disfigured by man rather than as God's world, potentially and progressively, but only through man's free co-operation, His perfect organ: the end to be as much Man's achievement as God's.'

<sup>1</sup> These words are taken from the introductory page contributed to Mr. Mozley's volume by Dr. T. B. Strong, then Bishop of Ripon, now of Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1925, p. 435.

<sup>3</sup> September 1925.



Fittingly does this author spell 'Man' as well as 'God' with the capital initial.

V. Still further ; if we are to estimate rightly the present theological situation, we must study it, not only in its constructions and criticisms, but in its *obiter dicta* while busy with other themes. For the mind of man is one ; and all our thoughts and strivings go to enrich—or to degrade—our thought of God and of His salvation.

There is the Pacifist outlook, represented in theories of Atonement by Professor C. J. Cadoux and others, but independently represented with immense zeal and self-confidence in general discussion and debate. According to this, the sufferings of the crucified Lord, eked out by the sufferings of saints, martyrs, and conscientious objectors, are ultimately to redeem an—as yet—unredeemed world.

There is the Christian Socialist outlook, which declares that love, mercy, generosity, is the whole of goodness ; that Justice is infra-Christian, and 'rights' inevitably 'selfish' ; and, in brief, that Christ came into the world to found the Labour Party. It is true that the clients of the Christian Socialists insist upon 'rights' and loudly demand what they call 'justice' ; but the pure theory of Christian Socialism seems to be what I have stated.

There is the Neo-Marcionism which despises the Old Testament because of its solemn emphasis upon justice and relatively lesser emphasis upon love. Dear, glorious, fascinating book, where everything is in the making and the faults that truly exist are faults of immaturity and not of decrepitude—how is it libelled to-day !

There is the doctrine that punishment is purely a reformatory process, and that, if it is ever inflicted in retribution for wrongs committed, such justice is nothing better than revenge. So distinguished a writer as Dr. Farnell, in his Gifford Lectures on

*The Attributes of God*, does not seem to envisage the possibility of any other motive for retributive punishment than malice and spite. So too the Birmingham 'Copec' Conference—an assemblage of warm young hearts and hot young heads—heard three brief speeches, all upon one side, and then voted down Capital Punishment. That most terrible of punishments is the most distinctively and characteristically penal ; hence the condemnation.

All these streams of tendency have one origin and one influence. Right for right's sake is despised and denied ; justice, as a distinguishable element in the moral ideal, is blotted out ; and God's love is degraded into an unethical softness. Not merely is faith uprooted ; its presuppositions are destroyed. The very soil in which it grew, and in which it might again have taken root, is washed away. This is the master error of our day, and the form in which the contemporary mind becomes guilty of apostasy from God. For, while justice is not the highest thing in the moral ideal or in the character of God, you never can think worthily of love or of grace if you deny justice. And, while the Atonement of Jesus Christ cannot be vindicated as a transferred punishment, if you do not believe in punishment you will never understand the Christian salvation. It is impossible here to argue in support of these positions. They can only be stated as theses which concern the life or the death of our Christian hope.

Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure ; and, although the Christian mind may suffer bewilderment, the Christian heart will respond in humble penitence and thankfulness to the great utterances of the New Testament in all their solemn fullness of meaning—utterances such as this : 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound : that, like as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.'

---

## Literature.

### SACRIFICE.

OF recent years the attention of Old Testament scholarship has been very largely concentrated upon the prophet : it is but fair that the priest

should have his turn. And it is a piece of peculiar good fortune that the problems connected with him and his functions should have been investigated by the man who, while he lived, was probably our greatest Semitic scholar, distinguished alike for



his range and accuracy. In the posthumous volume on *Sacrifice in the Old Testament, its Theory and Practice* (Milford; 16s. net), Professor George Buchanan Gray, D.Litt., has dealt very elaborately with the extremely intricate problems associated with sacrifice and the priesthood, both the larger problems, as, for example, the meaning of the sacrifice, and more specific problems, as the nature of the festivals, the paschal victim, the blood ritual of the passover, etc. The course of the discussion carries Dr. Gray into the investigation of other problems of great interest and importance, such as, Was Moses a priest? Were women ever officials of the cult? How far was the idea of propitiation associated with sacrificial custom? What are the origin and history of the altar?

In the discussion of these questions Dr. Gray lays under contribution the immense material of which he was master, drawing as easily upon the Minæan inscriptions as upon the Old Testament. There is a particularly careful and valuable discussion of the root כפר (E.V. 'to make atonement'), whose Arabic and Syriac counterparts respectively suggest 'to cover' and 'to wipe away'; here, as elsewhere, Dr. Gray avails himself of analogies drawn from Assyriology. One of his most interesting results is to establish the predominance of the eucharistic rather than the propitiatory purpose of sacrifice. On the vitally important question of the attitude of the prophets to sacrifice this is what Dr. Gray has to say: 'They were prepared to tolerate, and even themselves to make use of, these ancient institutions of religion, if only the people would not abuse them, by giving them a place in life that Yahweh never intended them to have' (p. 43). And again: 'We cannot safely conclude that all the prophets denounced sacrifice under all conditions; purged of its abuses they may have been ready enough to see the continuance of eucharistic sacrifice' (p. 89). Some scholars would demur to this: they would agree, however, that the prophets would not have been likely to admit 'either the expiatory or the propitiatory value of sacrifice'; and they would agree most of all with the conclusion that 'practically their attitude towards sacrifice, even unabused sacrifice, is at best one of indifference.'

This book should help to re-direct attention to the priest. Dr. Gray admits that 'the great personalities are to be sought among the prophets: the living force in times of crises is theirs; but the

maintenance of a permanent ethical and religious tradition, which needed at times, no doubt, vivifying by the direct law and challenge of the prophet, was the task of the priest,' and Dr. Gray's scholarly discussion sets the figure and the function of the prophet in a clear, dry light. He has given us a great book on a great subject, which is likely to influence opinion for a long time to come.

#### THE NATURE OF RELIGION.

Professor W. P. Paterson is probably as well qualified as any man to discuss *The Nature of Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 15s. net), the subject he selected for the first series of Gifford Lectures, which he delivered in the University of Glasgow in the Spring Term of 1924. They are characterized by all the massive learning, the philosophic grasp, and the religious insight which we are accustomed to look for in every utterance of his. The subjects discussed include the Religious Mind, Religion as Light, as Duty to God, and as Love of God, the Way of Salvation, etc., and each discussion is so carefully articulated that the argument, however abstruse, is easy to follow. Dr. Paterson has at his command a very wide range of philosophical and theological thought: Plato and Paul, Muhammad and Confucius, Frazer and McDougall are equally familiar to him.

His main concern in these lectures, he tells us, has been to show what religion 'has professed to be, and what it has undertaken to do' (p. 457), and religion itself, he remarks, 'might be defined as an optimism whose foundations are laid in pessimism' (p. 192). The whole book is, in a sense, a practical justification of this thesis. A very interesting chapter, which takes account of Freud, Coué, Myers, and others, deals with Religion and the Sub-conscious. Professor Paterson has a sympathetic temperament which enables him to present faithfully as well as to criticise candidly, any system of thought which meets him in the course of his discussion. His own outlook, needless to say, is frankly modern. Of the Word of God, for example, he writes that 'it has come to be generally agreed that, whatever polemical disadvantages it may entail, and whatever pain and concern it may give to devout souls, Theology has to content itself with a Word of God for which absolute inerrancy cannot be claimed' (p. 160). Again, discussing the death of Christ in his chapter



on The Way of Salvation, he remarks, 'Modern Theology has tended to magnify the quickening power of the great sacrifice, rather than its expiatory virtue, and it has had good reason for the change of emphasis' (p. 21). Again, 'It must be admitted that Theology has no direct knowledge of the original condition of mankind' (p. 434), the early chapters of Genesis notwithstanding.

In a deep sense the book, though it abounds in austere discussion, is a stimulus to devotion as well as to sound theological thinking. The God for whom it pleads is one who 'notwithstanding the reign of law is still a God of Providence, able to act in and through natural causes as the controller and disposer of all events' (p. 227), and He is the God of the individual as well as of the illimitable universe. It is at any rate, he argues, a 'sublime possibility'—and to Dr. Paterson we feel sure that this 'possibility' is one of his deepest convictions—that God 'condescends to take part in the life of the world in the character of an individual dealing with other individuals' (p. 456). The admirable caution with which every affirmation is presented does not succeed in obscuring the writer's enthusiasm for the great Christian verities.

#### GOD AND REASON.

It must strike any one who observes the current book issues how largely writers of the Roman persuasion are entering the lists. This is particularly true of apologetics, but it may be said of all other parts of the religious field. And the writing is good. It is often scholarly and always effective. One of the latest of these efforts is an essay in the borderland between philosophy and theology, *God and Intelligence in Modern Philosophy: A Critical Study in the Light of the Philosophy of Saint Thomas*, by Mr. Fulton J. Sheen, M.A., Ph.D., Agrégé de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie à l'Université de Louvain (Longmans; 15s. net). The writer has been fortunate enough to secure an introduction from the pen of Mr. G. K. Chesterton, and, as may be imagined, this is by far the most interesting part of the book. We do ourselves and our readers the pleasure of quoting a few words from this introduction which will at the same time indicate the drift of the work that follows. The Roman Church 'defends the wisdom of the world as the way of dealing with the world; she defends common sense and consistent thinking and the

perception that two and two make four. And to-day she is alone in defending them.' Again (of a problematical old lady), she 'is running after every raving fad of mysticism and credulity so long as it is opposed to reason. She is following M. Coué, who says it is better to call things better because they are worse. She is running after Mrs. Eddy because Mrs. Eddy denounces a toothache which does not exist for existing. She is running after Professor Einstein because he is credited with saying that straight lines are crooked, that parallel lines meet, and that a yard may measure more one way than another. She is running after the pragmatists because they have a proof that all proofs are worthless. . . . But the little priest is still sitting in his confessional-box believing that two and two make four, and living up to that.' And one more, of the modern idea of God: 'It is the view that Being is Becoming; or that God does not exist yet, but may be said to be living in hopes.' All this is very amusing paradox. Of course it is none of it quite true. All these people would indignantly deny that they say what Mr. Chesterton makes them say. But there is a sufficient spice of burlesqued truth to make the caricatures amusing. It is characteristic of Mr. Chesterton's flamboyant way of thinking that he asserts the Roman Church alone trusts in reason. One admires with a smile the sheer impudence of such an assertion, and one admires it all the more when one thinks of Transubstantiation and the collection of ancient superstitions which have been consecrated by the cloak of Rome. It is absurd, however, to take Mr. Chesterton in such a rôle seriously.

It will be gathered that Dr. Sheen is concerned to vindicate the claim of the intelligence in the region of faith in view of a widespread tendency in modern thought to lean more to the side of experience in its various forms. Now it is quite true that there is such a tendency, or has been. It is also true that various systems, both religious and psychological, have laid stress on the practical to the disrepute of the intellectual. In addition to those mentioned by Mr. Chesterton, there is the New Psychology whose whole burden is a depreciation of reason; there is also the influential movement headed by Otto who already has imitators and followers in this country. On the other hand, we may say two things of such movements as Pragmatism and the whole circle of thought it



represents—one is that it is true so far as it goes. It stands for an emphasis on the importance of life, of experience, of actual practical results. This is the truth in Ritschlianism, Pragmatism, Humanism, the New Psychology, and the rest. And it is valuable truth. But we may also say another thing about this way of thinking. Its dominance is nearly over. It has left us a truth, and we are grateful for that. But we have seen its one-sidedness and imperfection. And it is really not true to say, as Dr. Sheen does, that modern philosophy has rejected the intelligence. Much can be quoted from certain quarters, no doubt, of this nature. But philosophy still relies on intelligence, and uses it, as one can see from any typical modern philosophical treatise. The truth is that, while we can demonstrate the being of God and perhaps certain of His attributes by reason, no one in this world ever gained a real living faith in God except through experience. We need reason, but we cannot live without a real fellowship with God. At the same time an able essay like Dr. Sheen's will help to keep its readers' minds well balanced and sane in their religious outlook. It is interesting and well worth reading.

#### HENRY MONTAGU BUTLER.

For over thirty years Henry Montagu Butler was Master of Trinity College. It is an account of these years—from his fifty-fourth year onwards—that has now been written by his son, Mr. J. R. M. Butler. It will be remembered that about five years ago a *Life* by Mr. Edward Graham appeared. Mr. Graham felt, however, that as an Oxford man he was not the right person to deal with Dr. Butler's years at Cambridge, and so he confined himself to his Harrow life, down to his resignation in 1885. The title of the present memoir is *Henry Montagu Butler: Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1886-1918* (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net). Writing of Dr. Butler, Dean Inge said: 'He was one of the very few *great* men of our time—at least that is my impression of him, and I have met most of our leading men. . . . I have to bless his memory for many acts of personal kindness; no one who has known him can ever forget him.' On an earlier occasion Dean Inge wrote to Dr. Butler: 'One of our first remarks to each other was, "How delightful it will be to get a letter of congratulation from the Master of Trinity." And so we are not surprised

to receive from you the most delightful of all our letters.' Putting these two together we have not a bad picture of the Master of Trinity. He was great, and his greatness was pre-eminently that of character—a character in which the most salient trait was probably that of kindness. He was of those who do not forget their friends in their good or ill fortune, and his letters were always delightful to receive. Mr. Graham's account of the Harrow days differs from the present volume. The early years were full of incident, and the narrative of them 'was at once the biography of the headmaster and the school.' But there was no such incident in the later years, and so Mr. J. R. M. Butler has sought 'not to tell a story but to draw a picture, hoping he may help his descendants to realize what were the main features of a character of unusual beauty, whose influence spread far beyond the precincts of Cambridge.'

In 1859 Montagu Butler wrote for his private eye a confession of 'faith' and of 'infidelity,' but there is more faith in it than infidelity, for, as he says himself, he was 'not sceptical, sadly uncritical.' All through it the words 'I love' and 'I admire' occur. 'I admire everything which seems lofty.' 'I admire intensely capacity for emotion.' 'I love to see a fire lying dormant under a gentle eye.' 'I love to trace anything strictly human and genuine in all the great thinkers and doers, Plato, Coleridge, Burke, Arnold, L. da Vinci, M. Angelo, Napoleon, Hare, Maurice, Gladstone, Chatham, G. Adolphus, Dante, Goethe, Schiller, Luther. This love for all human seems to me almost the only definite conviction in my mind.' 'I love the Bible—almost all the parts of it that I understand, chiefly the Gospels, and of those St. Luke's and St. John's most. St. Luke's is so human; St. John's brings down heaven to you. St. Paul I love better for his glorious character, for his fire, for his loving enthusiasm, than for his formal arguments. I do not think he quite understood marriage, though he has written the best things about it, *i.e.* to the Ephesians.'

Dr. Montagu Butler by his kindliness, by his personal magnetism, by his wise hospitality, by his eminent intellectual gifts, but more than all by the sheer beauty of his character made for himself a unique position as Master of Trinity. But in spite of this the office was not without great difficulties. The government of the College was in the hands of a council of thirteen, of whom the majority were



elected by the whole body of Fellows. The Master's position on the council was really that of chairman. There was often considerable difference of outlook, and opposition to the suggestions he made. He was very sensitive, and he was often depressed.

The restraint with which this memoir is written is admirable, and so perhaps we welcome all the more the few intimate and light touches. Mr. J. R. M. Butler is the oldest son of Montagu Butler's second marriage—a marriage which he contracted with Miss Agnata Ramsay, the young senior classic of 1888—was born in July 1889, and Gordon in 1891. His death at Kantara during the War was the great sorrow of Dr. Butler's later life. The youngest, born in December 1893, was given the name of Nevile. 'The first of these babies was vulgarly known as Herodotus, in honour of his mother's edition of the seventh book of the History;—see *Punch*, December 7, 1889, "A Pardonable Mistake" (with illustration by du Maurier). "Young Mother (lately from Girton): 'Come in, dear. Excuse me for one moment. I'm just ordering a crib for Herodotus.' Fair Friend (not from Girton): 'Oh, that's what you're going to call dear Baby, is it?'"—the second was called Cato, since his arrival on a day when his father voted in a minority in the Senate House clearly showed support of a defeated cause; and the third, Tacitus, *a non tacendo*.'

#### AN ASSAM TRIBE.

Surely the interest in anthropology and primitive religion must be much more widespread than one would think. For the stream of books upon the subject is unending; and as a rule they are not cheap to buy, and always must be difficult to write. Yet still they pour on in a steady procession. No less than three have appeared quite recently on one unimportant people. Here is one of them, *The Ao Naga Tribe of Assam*, by Professor W. C. Smith, A.M., Ph.D. (Macmillan; 21s. net). It is an honest book, incorporating notes from authorities who differ at places; and having an Introduction by one of these, Dr. J. H. Hutton, who, while he writes warmly, here and there dissents. There is much work at the back of it (note the huge bibliography); and it is published by direction of the Government of Assam.

The Ao Nagas are a kindly primitive people, dwelling in a wholly hilly country, whose old ways

and customs are rapidly breaking down, now that civilization is impinging on them. When left alone, they were a litigious lot, living, too, in a constant snarl and bicker of warfare. For damsels jeered at a youth who had not a human head or two to show them. Nor did it matter if the trophy were a woman's, or even a baby's! A head was a head! A merry enough people, they appear to have had no childhood. Chastity began only with marriage. A man's wealth is reckoned by the number of his granaries of rice, which he lets rot rather than sell! Life is made miserable by belief in uncountable malicious spirits, though there is some dim idea of a good God. There is a Creator, who was gradually flattening the earth, when unhappily a war broke out. To this he had to turn his attention; and so the hills remain. Since all fines go to the elders who try the cases, justice is uncertain; and the diviners and the like load the dice in their own favour too. The other world is no better than this. The spirits of animals we have maltreated lie in wait for ours. Hence, take your dog with you. After living yonder the same number of years as you did here, you will become a butterfly for ever. Two interesting chapters conclude the book, in one a terrible calling of witnesses as to the evil results of civilization bursting in on a primitive people, the other giving a vivid picture of the courage of native Christians in defying hoary custom. But there is a wise appeal to be positive, not merely negative; to give something better as well as take away the bad. Be sure, for instance, if you put down head-hunting with its excitement, to introduce, say, football in its place, or the result may not be altogether happy. A heart, swept and garnished from foul things, but left empty, invites trouble.

#### THE MEDIEVAL VILLAGE.

In many quarters there is a tendency to magnify the social service rendered by the Medieval Church and to urge the present-day application of the principle of 'A Fair Price' and other doctrines which formed part of the teaching of the Church of the Middle Ages. Dr. G. G. Coulton in *The Medieval Village* (Cambridge University Press; 25s. net) provides us with abundance of evidence which makes it impossible to appraise thus highly the contribution which the Church made at that period. The author disclaims any attempt to



furnish any theory, but seeks rather to provide material for subsequent inquiry; nevertheless, he has done good service in showing how unfounded are the opinions on this subject of Mr. G. K. Chesterton, and of some authorities whom he criticises in a trenchant appendix on 'Interested Misstatements.'

He contends that while feudal conditions in Great Britain were more satisfactory than elsewhere, and while the better conditions of the period 1450-1500 form an exception to his general outline of the situation, all over Europe there were great wrongs to redress, and social evils of such magnitude that the peasants had some reason for feeling that 'God and his saints had fallen asleep.' While there were many noble exceptions, and while the author does not blame the individual monk so much as the system, yet, in so far as the Church and the saints were synonymous, they were either asleep or impotent in the presence of grievous injustices. While the Church made a valuable contribution along educational lines, the monk who owned land was first a landlord and only secondarily a 'religious,' and he generally was as exacting and almost as unsympathetic as the lay landlord. This is a noteworthy contribution to the bibliography of Medievalism, and presents in a particularly interesting manner a mass of valuable evidence.

#### EGYPTIAN PAPYRI.

Every one has heard about Egyptian papyri, but not every one knows the romance associated with the hunt for them and with their marvellously heterogeneous contents. This is the story which, in both its chapters, Mr. James Baikie, F.R.A.S., has set out to tell in his *Egyptian Papyri and Papyrus-Hunting* (R.T.S.; 10s. 6d. net), and he has told it extraordinarily well. He tells the whole story, beginning with the ancient papyri, and carrying it down to the slightly more familiar papyri of Græco-Roman times, with which Dr. Milligan has helped to make us acquainted. Among the ancient papyri he gives us specimens of historical and legal texts, also of poetry, fiction, and funerary papyri; among the later papyri he gives us specimens of theological and literary texts, including, for example, the logia of Jesus and fragments of Pindar and Sappho, also of official, legal, and personal documents and letters.

One valuable feature of his book is that he not

only discusses the papyri, he presents them in long and continuous extracts. Of thrilling interest, for example, is the chapter he devotes to the adventures of Wenamon on his more than exciting trip from Egypt to Byblos—adventures which outrival those of Robinson Crusoe; here, too, is the famous Tale of the Two Brothers, which probably influenced the story of Joseph. The last chapter, from the Græco-Roman period, is peculiarly interesting with its revelations of domestic life peeping out from every line of letters which were never meant to be seen but by the eyes of those to whom they were sent. Mr. Baikie's running comments are often refreshingly candid: much of the Book of the Dead he regards as 'trash,' the shoemakers of Antinoë were quite familiar with the modern trick of paper soles, the writing of the funerary papyri was often scamped and conscienceless to an incredible degree, and so on. But the contents of the rubbish-heaps make clear that the Greek-speaking Egyptian was 'in average of intellectual culture out of sight a better man than the average Briton of to-day.'

Mr. Baikie is pretty hard on the priests, though 'the Egyptian priest's record is no worse than that of the priests of other lands. Priesthood has always stood for the debauching of the pure ideals of a religion.' Always? That is a hard saying. But we quite agree when he says that 'we can never have more than enough of material which either makes the past more living to the present, or helps to elucidate the great works of the supreme writers of the classical age.' This is a living picture of the ancient world which makes us feel that 'the ancient Egyptian was one with ourselves in all that makes human life.'

#### CATHEDRALS OF ENGLAND.

There is undoubtedly a growing interest in ecclesiology and in ecclesiastical architecture. This probably is largely due to the energy of the Anglo-Catholic movement, but it is also assisted by modern facilities in road transport. For towns and villages, once 'off the map,' are now readily reached and a new field of antiquarian and æsthetic delight opened up to the ordinary tourist. The present age is further interested in 'local colour.' We are now realizing the influence that popular manners and customs have exerted upon all forms—architectural, ritualistic, literary—and



we have come to appreciate the fact that without a knowledge of the local colour much of the meaning of those forms is hidden from us.

Particularly is a knowledge of local colour needed when studying an old building, be it house, church, castle, or cathedral. We must understand the reason for its ground plan; we must know the symbolic significance of its detail; we must discover the underlying causes which have resulted in particular forms of architectural expression. Only by such an approach can an intelligent view of the whole structure be opened up.

Professor A. Hamilton Thompson, who occupies the Chair of Mediæval History in the University of Leeds, is a man so eminent in his subject that all that comes from his pen is authoritative, and sufficiently human to enable him to appreciate the needs of less gifted people. He has contributed a book on *The Cathedral Churches of England* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net) which will do much to dissipate the confusion which clouds the history of these buildings. It is not an architectural treatise, for it contains only one chapter on the purely architectural development of the English cathedral. It aims, instead, 'to provide some account, not merely of the buildings, but of the institutions connected with them, and to treat the cathedral itself as an institution rather than to deal with cathedrals as individual structures.' The origin of the cathedral system; the internal arrangement and furniture of the cathedral; methods of building; sources of revenue and rules for its expenditure; the daily life and duties of the cathedral staff; the services and their significance are fully dealt with in successive chapters. An exhaustive and classified bibliography adds a further value to the volume.

---

#### DARWIN SUPPLEMENTED.

*The Ascent of Man by Means of Natural Selection*, by Mr. Alfred Machin (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), is an elaborate attempt to explain the evolution of the human race by means of Darwin's own principle, understood better than Darwin understood it. Briefly, the author wishes to do two things: first, to show that, while Darwin's Natural Selection is inadequate to explain the facts, the principle is sound if restated in other terms; and secondly, to show that for an adequate explanation of the whole course of evolution and of its detailed facts and

events, a naturalistic explanation is all that is necessary. To take the latter point first, the author acknowledges the immense influence religion has had in the development of man. He also admits that up to now Christianity has had the main influence on the course of man's civilization. But he thinks that, now we have a sound and satisfying explanation of evolution, this can be made to do instead of religion. This part of his book is poor and inadequate. The discussion of religion is not worthy of a serious scientific work which the book otherwise has claims to be. Like many other writers of a similar type he does not really understand what Christianity is. He roundly asserts that, according to Christianity, poverty is an essential part of piety, and that there is no place for recreation or physical sports in 'Christian philosophy'! The following words have a paragraph to themselves: 'Divested of its adventitious trappings, Christianity seems little more than a persuasion to righteousness and love.' The 'little more' is delicious. If it could but persuade men to righteousness and love, not all the evolutionists in the world could challenge its supremacy.

In fairness to the author we hasten to say that these somewhat ridiculous passages are not typical of the purely scientific part of his book, which is a serious and persuasive argument. His main contention is that Darwin's theory of natural selection must be supplemented somewhat as follows: Darwin contended that redundant reproduction causes a struggle for existence which gives rise to natural selection. Mr. Machin's view is that 'the struggle for existence' is the fundamental term, and the chain of causation is the following: the struggle for existence gives rise to natural selection, which acts with equal force on Preservation *and* Reproduction. It was this last point Darwin omitted, and it makes all the difference. There you have a complete explanation of all that has occurred not only in lower forms but all through the kingdom of life. This contention is supported by a careful and elaborate examination of the factors which have been operative in development. The book will have to be reckoned with. It is evidently the fruit of much labour and of prolonged research. The points are well selected, both those from natural history and those from human history, like the story of Rome. Mr. Machin sticks doggedly to his theorem, and, so far as his modification of Darwin is concerned, he seems to us to have made



a good case. It is only when he begins to reason on wider lines that he wields a very inadequate instrument.

---

Under the title *Greek Culture and the Greek Testament*, Professor Doremus Almy Hayes (Garrett Biblical Institute) has published a plea for the study of the Greek classics and the Greek New Testament (Abingdon Press; \$1.50). The first part of his book is a sustained panegyric of the Greeks, their art, philosophy, language, and way of life, with copious extracts from the works of enthusiasts for the Greeks. The second part deals with the Greek New Testament, and contains numerous illustrations of the treasures contained in it, which are available only for the student who can read it in the original.

---

All Christians will agree with Dr. Holmes's denunciation of War and the foolish and mischievous patriotism which means 'my country right or wrong' (*Patriotism is not Enough*, by John Haynes Holmes. Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). All will say 'Amen' to his aspiration for the growth of universal humanitarianism and love for all mankind. When he maintains, however, that one necessary change is the substitution of socialism for capitalism, and another the surrender by Christianity of all theologies and ritualisms in favour of preaching, in alliance with all other religions, the brotherhood of man, many will be unable to follow him. And when he recommends that the Churches should insist that the members of the various denominations shall on no consideration ever consent to fight with their co-religionists of other countries, some may feel that he is perilously near the grotesque. For if a burglar is breaking into my house, it seems quite irrelevant to ask him if he be a Presbyterian before I send for the police. There is in active existence a Power which is uniting humanity, is doing many of the international services to which Dr. Holmes looks forward, and has actually prevented quite a number of wars already. It is known as the League of Nations. To judge by his book, Dr. Holmes has never heard of it.

---

In *Nature Pioneers of the Insect World*, by the Rev. Joseph Ritson (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net), we have an excellent popular work upon a certain department of Natural History. It comprises thirty-three

addresses to young people by one who has mastered the literature of his subject, who has invested it with a romantic charm, and who has proved himself to be a keen and accurate observer of Nature. Mr. Ritson has the gift of portraying with vivid pen-pictures most interesting particulars regarding ants, bees, wasps, caterpillars, moths, termites, spiders, and flies, and shows how these lowly creatures have anticipated man by hundreds of thousands of years in agriculture, in manufactures, in industry, in social organization, in sanitation, and *mirabile dictu* in such inventions as the telephone, aeroplane, and wireless. To all teachers of the young, as well as to all interested in Nature Study, we heartily recommend this inexpensive volume.

---

Two years ago there appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES an account of a medieval Dutch Harmony of the Gospels which had turned out to be a translation of an extremely archaic Old-Latin form of Tatian's 'Diatessaron,' the Latin translation having apparently been made directly from the Syriac and independently of the known Greek Gospels. Dr. D. Plooi of Leyden, to whom we owe the first published account of the MS., has now given us an interim report of the work being done on it in *A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron* (E. J. Brill, Leyden).

Dr. Plooi replies with great spirit to Jülicher's criticisms. He thinks it proved that the attempt to recover the Old-Latin Text should start from this MS. The facts suggest that Tatian wrote his Syriac Diatessaron in the first place for the numerous oriental population of Rome, Carthage, and Lyons, who were not conversant with Greek and were more or less neglected by the Greek authorities of the Church; this in opposition to the common view that he wrote it after his return to Syria. Another bold assumption which the author now thinks justified is that of a Syriac original for the Latin Marcionite Gospel.

---

One of the best monographs on individual philosophers that we have seen is *Johannes Scotus Erigena: A Study in Mediæval Philosophy*, by Henry Bett, M.A., of Handsworth College, Birmingham (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net). The plan is admirable. We have in order: the Life and Writings of Erigena; His Philosophy, a Summary; His Philosophy, an Exposition; Sources and



Authorities ; and lastly, the Influence of Erigena upon Later Times.

Little is really known of Erigena's life. He was not a Scot but an Irishman, and Erigena was not his name at all. He was either Jerugena or Scotigena. Yet Mr. Bett wisely concludes that the time-sanctioned name Erigena should be continued, 'General usage and general convenience must surely overrule a pedantic accuracy.' The summary of the philosophy is a remarkable achievement. It is no mere summary. It is an actual condensation of the philosopher's writings, which reproduces, so far as possible, Erigena's own words.

Mr. Bett has filled a lacuna in English philosophical literature, and filled it brilliantly with a modest-sized volume which is both philosophy and literature.

A little book, crowded with interest of many kinds, has just been published by the Cambridge University Press (7s. 6d. net). It is interesting alike to the student of the Greek Language, of the Middle Ages, of the Old Testament, of Legend, of Poetry, and of Art. It is a selection of *Old Testament Legends*, from a Greek poem written about the year 1500 by Georgios Chumnos, probably a native of Crete. Mr. F. H. Marshall, M.A., has rendered a valuable service to scholarship by translating and editing it, and not less by his illuminating introduction, in which he discusses the character of the poem, and shows how these legendary accretions, to which we have parallels in our own medieval literature, would stimulate popular interest in the Bible. Some of the legends are grotesque, like that of the resurrection of the calf slaughtered by Abraham to feast his three guests, but all of them are interesting. The Greek is in rhymed couplets, and an exact idea of its rhythm can be gathered from these lines, which somewhat freely translate the episode to which we have just alluded :

But when those youthful travellers had risen to  
their feet,  
That calf rose too and gambolling did run its dam  
to meet.

There is a glossary to the less familiar Greek words. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by the reproduction of twenty-eight quaint pictures which, in the original MS., illustrated the narratives to which they are attached.

Canon Sell has wisely followed up his valuable series of Commentaries on the Old Testament with a volume on *The Kingdom of Israel* (Church Missionary Society), which is characterized by the same accurate scholarship and critical honesty as marked his Commentaries. It was a good idea to separate the history of Israel from that of Judah, so that we can follow the fortunes of the one kingdom without being distracted by the consideration of the other. The Septuagint has been wisely used and all the relevant literature carefully considered, with the result that the narrative is as reliable as it is graphic, and the motives of the leading actors, no less than the historical facts, come to light. The perspective of the Hebrew story is also preserved by Canon Sell in the ample space which he very rightly accords to Elijah and Elisha ; and such parts of the narrative as are of special interest to Indian readers, as, for example, Naaman's bowing in the house of Rimmon, are happily treated. Preachers who have no elaborate critical history of Israel could not do better than secure this book.

That indefatigable worker in the Master's vineyard, the Bishop of London, has issued through Messrs. Wells, Gardner & Co. Ltd., a small volume of mission addresses delivered in different centres of his diocese, under the title *The Spirit of Jesus* (3s. 6d. net). These addresses bear the stamp of the special occasion for which they were prepared, but the value of the book at the present time when preachers are more and more disposed to meet the people in the open, to reason with them and endeavour to meet their difficulties, will be found in the series of 'Questions and Answers' contained throughout its pages. These are the right kind of questions, and the answers to them are given with the necessary fullness and clearness. The volume will be helpful to those engaged in this form of evangelistic preaching.

Here is the fifth and last volume of 'Lessons on the Way,' by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D. (Heffers ; 4s. net), those admirable little studies for teachers. The aim has been, so we are told, to provide 'a clear and credible account of the Christian religion which can be used by the ordinary person, the teacher, the parent, and in study circles.' It has been realized. Dr. Dearmer gives the impression that he himself has found real pleasure in putting his thoughts together, and his enjoyment



is infectious. It will be a dull and heavy class that grows drowsy and fidgety when truth is presented to them so freshly. This last volume deals with *The Lord's Prayer and The Sacraments*.

A little companion volume to 'Dont's for Church Organists,' and 'Dont's for Choirmasters,' has been written by Mr. John Newton. It is *Dont's for Choirmen* (Heffers; 6d. net). We can thoroughly recommend it, for it is full of the soundest advice. Don't spoil the endings as Amen~ur: don't mispronounce words—troub-alled not troub-bled. And much more of this kind.

There is no doubt that the really strong arguments for Spiritualism are the narratives of personal experiences written by those whose *bona fides* cannot be impugned. A remarkable instance of this kind is *Love and Death: A Narrative of Fact* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). There is a foreword by Sir Oliver Lodge in which he says that the cumulative evidence, not of mere survival, but of continued interest and affection, goes on increasing. Certainly this narrative, written unwillingly but from a strong religious sense of duty, is a very noteworthy document. The writer says that all possibility of mind-reading is excluded in her case, and if this were quite assured, her story would have a powerful appeal for the cause she advocates. In any case, our minds should be open and ready to consider facts of whatever kind. Among these *Love and Death* will have its own place.

Many books have been written for teachers to show them how to teach the Bible to children. Some of these are too advanced. Some demand more from the average teacher in knowledge or in equipment than he possesses. What many a teacher wants is guidance which he can use just where he is and with the equipment he already possesses, not to save him trouble but to show him the way. A book of this kind has just been published which will be of priceless worth to this sort of teacher: *Jesus among the Children*, by the Rev. C. Salisbury Woodward (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). Mr. Woodward has been very successful in addressing children, and, if his addresses were anything like his book, we do not wonder. It consists of a series of talks on the life of Christ. There are several introductory chapters giving counsel

which is within the reach of ordinary people and is exceedingly valuable. What he has to say on the three 'I's' is an instance. The teacher must be Intelligible, Interesting, and Imaginative. All that he writes on these points is worth reading. And what he means by them can be read in his own lessons. He tells the story of Jesus, incident by incident, very simply, but in a fashion that would enthral any audience of children. Both in its theory and practice this book is one that will spread a sound and helpful gospel of teaching wherever it goes. We wish it a wide circulation.

Out of his work the Principal of Manchester College tells us that there has come a faith, and it is this faith that he explains in *The Faith of a Worker* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). In passing let us say that Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton are to be congratulated on the price at which they have published the volume. There are nine chapters in the book, and in each of them Dr. Jacks grapples with one of those problems which are not only pressing to-day but which from their very nature have always teased men's minds. The first and last chapters are probably the most deep-searching. The first is concerned with the challenge of death. It is the fashion to-day to evade challenges, but Dr. Jacks will have us meet them. We must grasp the nettle. Like Arnold of Winkelried, 'religion must put her arms round the spears and gather them into her bosom.' How does he meet this challenge of death? Personal immortality will not do it, he thinks. What is needed, Dr. Jacks says, is the doctrine of Divine Immanence. In the last chapter we have Dr. Jacks' philosophy of work. *The Faith of a Worker* is not uniformly excellent, but it makes stimulating reading though we may not follow Dr. Jacks all the way.

Those who have to address mothers' meetings, girls' clubs, foreign mission collectors, and other groups of Church workers will find considerable help in Mrs. G. H. Morrison's *Addresses for Women Workers* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). With much good counsel and many a little story these talks are made practical and interesting, and in simple language the truths of the evangelical faith are pressed home.

There can be few who have any concern with



the English language who do not know Roget's *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases*: Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and to Assist in Literary Composition. The work first appeared in 1879, and there have been so many editions of it that the stereo plates are worn out. Now a new edition has been prepared by the author's grandson, Samuel Romilly Roget (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). The original system of classification has been retained, but the work is enlarged by the inclusion of two thousand fresh words and expressions. To those who have not yet acquired the Thesaurus habit, we would say that this is an excellent opportunity of doing so.

'Are we right in bringing religion under the sway of reason? Is theology subordinate to philosophy, and is a reasonable faith that after which religion ought to strive? Must all the varied forms of religion find their differences resolved in the light of pronouncements made by the philosophy of religion? I believe that religion ought to fix her eyes on a mark more distant than any which can be reached by reason. If religion is to hold sway over the hearts of men and to guide them towards the destiny desired from the very depths of their souls, she must open out to men a realm of being beyond that where reason holds sway, and enable them to overcome death, who bids reason call a halt, and whose bidding reason dare not disobey.' This is the thesis which the Rev. E. E. Thomas, M.A., D.Litt., upholds in *The Non-Rational Character of Faith* (Longmans; 6s. net). Dr. Thomas examines first the nature of the soul, contending that, while philosophy can give no real account of it, religion can. He then passes on to discuss Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, and holds that in regard to these great values, taken in their richest sense, philosophy fails to satisfy us and only religion can. The book is in some respects an echo of Otto's famous essay which has had so wide an influence in Germany and is bound to produce its crop of discipleship here.

But though Dr. Thomas may have been inspired by Otto, his thinking is his own, and the argument he submits is a piece of very thorough work, independent, sincere, and marked by real ability. Like all extremes it contains a large element of truth, but it will probably fail to present itself as the whole truth. At any rate this book is worth reading as a stimulating and competent essay in the borderland between philosophy and theology.

*Thorns*, by E. A. Bryans (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), is a discussion of the presence of pain in the world and the purpose of it. The bulk of the book is in the form of letters. There is also a long Introduction by Father Vernon, S.D.C. Both the Introduction and the Letters follow the same lines, and are concerned not with the origin of pain, but with its use. Suffering, they find, can become redemptive not for ourselves only, but for others too, and the presence of the thorns is an infallible sign that God's children are on the right path.

The Rev. John Macmillan has written a small book on *The Crucified and Risen Bible* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net), the controlling idea of which is the analogy between Jesus and the Bible, it, like Him, having a birth, a life, and a crucifixion. There is much that is good and true, much also that is fanciful, as when we are told that the animals slain in Gn 3 to secure coverings for Adam and Eve were 'likely lambs, whose blood symbolized the blood of Jesus.' In keeping with this is the depreciation of Wellhausen on p. 66 f., and the rather absurd question on p. 75, with regard to documentary analysis (J, E, P), 'We want to know if that is the thing that has dried the tears of centuries of saints.' We are not aware of any critic who has made this claim. It is good that the cobbler should stick to his last.

In *Travel Talks on the Holy Land*, by Mary A. Hatch (Marshall Brothers; 5s. net), we have the impressions of one who has visited the most sacred places of Palestine in recent times. Miss Hatch is an experienced traveller and a keen observer, and has set forth the record of her travels in the form of a diary. It will be suggestive and helpful to those who have to give lessons on New Testament Scripture to young people.

From Messrs. Morgan & Scott there comes, written by the Rev. Frank C. Raynor, *The Giant Masquerade* (6s. net). The book is better than its title, which last is, indeed, characteristic of a certain straining which shows now and then in the vivid and effective style. The book consists of a series of rapid sketches of the Decline and Reviving of the Christian Church up to and through the Reformation, and of the greater figures that pass across the stage, St. Francis, Dante, Giotto, Luther,

and the like. They are short and vivid, and written with a certain breathless eagerness, as of one bursting in with what he must tell.

‘To a Friend of God, The Man in the Pew—Theophilus of the Twentieth Century’ is a dedication that awakens curiosity. It is preliminary to a highly successful attempt to describe the earliest days of Christianity as they would be seen by an observer or a participant between A.D. 29 and 50. The book is called *Those Earliest Days*, and the writer subscribes himself Tychicus (Murray ; 7s. 6d. net). In effect the book is a vivid exposition of the first half of the Acts of the Apostles. There is an Introduction on the actual situation, and then the writer gives us the text in his own translation with an explanatory comment on each section, somewhat after the manner of Sir William Ramsay’s ‘St. Paul the Traveller.’ There is a great deal of sound learning behind this work, but the writer has always in view ‘the less learned lovers of God.’ His desire is to help the man in the twentieth-century pew to feel the same assurance about Divine things as St. Luke provided for *his* Theophilus in the first century. There are many things to praise in this interesting and valuable book. The divisions and headings are one. The popular and vivid style is another. The provision of essential knowledge in an easy way is a third. On pp. 67–69, to take one instance, there is a careful list of passages taken from the Book of Acts which shows how well the Apostles’ Creed justifies its name. All who desire to live again ‘those earliest days’ may well betake themselves to Tychicus and put themselves under his guidance. A word of praise is due to the publisher for the beautiful printing and general appearance of the book.

The interest attaching to Rosamond Kimball’s book on *The Wooing of Rebekah, and Other Bible Plays* (Scribners, \$2.50) is that the stories dramatized follow, as far as possible, the words of the Bible text itself. Thus the personal equation does not enter into the reconstruction of the Bible stories, but they are allowed to speak for themselves, the necessary background of recital being filled in by a reader behind the scenes, who also uses the words of the Bible. We can well believe, as the Introduction claims, that these simple plays produced a profound impression not only on the audience, but on the young players who felt the

need of qualifying by heart as well as by head for their respective parts. The stories dramatized deal with Rebekah, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Ruth, David and Jonathan, Elijah and Elisha, the Nativity, the Prodigal Son, and the Resurrection. Full instructions are given with regard to costumes, music, etc. These short plays, which can be produced quite inexpensively, would bring the Bible narrative home as nothing else could. There are some beautiful illustrations, and three selections from Bach’s St. Matthew’s Passion Music. ‘Thou cometh’ (p. 8), ‘spontaniety’ (p. 21), and ‘who’ for ‘whom’ (p. 22, l. 16) should be altered in the next edition.

What an indefatigable pen Mr. Boreham has. Here is his seventeenth volume of addresses, and it is as fresh as the first. In it he lets us into one of the secrets of his wonderful output. It is to set down the subject that he has in his heart to write on. It may be that he does not write on it for ten years, but there it is, all the time at the back of his mind, and he keeps storing up suitable incidents as he goes up and down his far Australian parish. The title of the new volume is *The Crystal Pointers* (Sharp ; 5s. net)—the two bright points of light which are no part of the Southern Cross but which point to it. And so Mr. Boreham says, ‘these papers point to things that no man can afford to miss : that is their only glory.’

In *Plain Talks to Lancashire People*, by the Rev. Canon John Sinker, Vicar of Blackburn (Skeffingtons ; 3s. 6d. net), we have a fine example of an earnest type of preaching suited to the needs of a great industrial centre. Canon Sinker is one of the clergy who has a sincere admiration for those among whom he labours, and an intense joy in his work among them. He describes these addresses as ‘just simple, plain, homely talks to the people.’ They are at the same time the outcome of sound learning, shrewd common sense, and an intimate knowledge of the peculiar needs of the population of a great city. He can speak to his congregations most frankly and most kindly and with the spirit of the Christian pastor.

In *Religion and Natural Science*, by Mr. E. Haigh, M.A., B.Sc. (S.C.M. ; 4s. 6d. net ; paper covers, 3s. net), we have a valuable introduction to many of the deeper problems of the day by an experienced



teacher of physical science. Mr. Haigh's treatment of such subjects as 'Natural Science and Religion,' 'Natural Science and the Bible,' 'Evolution,' 'The New Psychology and Religion,' 'Nature a Divine Revelation,' is excellent. His wide reading is apparent on every page, and his extracts from leaders of religious, philosophic, and scientific thought are informative.

The following quotations will show Mr. Haigh's standpoint: 'Has Natural Science anything to do with Religion? Very little—very little indeed . . . an educated religious man cannot be wholly indifferent to the scientific knowledge of his age. Though no one is responsible for ignorance which is unavoidable, yet no one is at liberty to reject facts or wilfully shut his eyes to truth from whatever quarter it may come. He cannot so act without injury to his moral character.' 'It is of happy augury that so many of the leaders in science at the present time are enforcing the truth that the scientific view of Nature is but a partial view which leads up to and requires the complement of a spiritual interpretation.'

In 1893 Christina Rossetti prepared a number of her poems for separate publication. They had already appeared along with prose devotional studies. The volume was called simply *Verses*, by

*Christina G. Rossetti*. And twenty-one thousand copies of it were sold up to 1914. Now the S.P.C.K. has issued a new edition (3s. 6d. net), containing an introduction and appreciation and a crayon drawing of Christina and her mother by Dante Gabriel Rossetti. The direct simplicity of Christina Rossetti's language, coupled with the appeal of her mysticism, have made for her a unique place in the affections of some of us.

The Rev. D. C. Mitchell, M.A., has found an attractive title for the volume of sermons which he has published through Messrs. Thomson & Cowan. It is *The Nonsense of Neutrality* (3s. 6d. net). The title is taken from his treatment of the eleventh verse of Obadiah, 'In the day that thou stoolest on the other side, thou wast as one of them.' The title is not only captivating, it is also informing, for this volume of sermons is concerned with the Christian conduct of life. Dealing with neutrality, for example, Mr. Mitchell discusses its consequences and culpability as a sin first of all against the self, and secondly against society. He ends on the evangelical note, which is characteristic, when he shows how one can be saved from this sin. The teaching in the sermons is pointed by apt illustrations both from literature and from Mr. Mitchell's personal experience.

## The Two Descriptions of the Sanctuary in Deuteronomy.

BY PROFESSOR ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July 1925 I published an article on this subject. The reason for returning to it so soon is that Canon Battersby Harford, in the November issue of the *Expositor*, has discussed the article and my entire attitude on the question at some length. It is true that few things are less interesting than a debate between two specialists. But the issue involved here is of such significance that a reply may be of value, especially if the discussion is severely restricted to broad principles.

There are, then, two descriptions of the sanctuary, (a) which Yahweh elects out of all your tribes, (b) which Yahweh elects in one of thy tribes. As to

(a) there is no debate; it means the temple at Jerusalem. But as to (b) I have pointed out that, wherever *one* followed by a plural noun occurs in Deuteronomy, it always means 'any of.' The natural sense, therefore, of 'one of thy tribes' is any tribe, not a specific tribe, such as Judah. The reason for this sanctuary being prefaced by the definite article is that it is followed by a qualifying clause. The shrine was to be one reserved to the worship of Yahweh.

So to translate the phrase is, of course, to deny its reference to centralization and to run counter to the interpretation which has been constantly put upon it. The Canon, accordingly, indulges in a

gentle jibe at my expense by remarking that for two thousand years the words have received only one meaning. The sarcasm would be legitimate, had it come from one like Wiener, who believes in the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy, but is a little surprising from a convinced Wellhausenite. Perhaps the Canon will reckon up for us the number of centuries during which the Deuteronomic Code was believed to have been issued by Moses on the plains of Moab, before Wellhausen 'proved' it to have been issued by Josiah in 621. It hardly becomes those whose entire position represents a break from tradition to make much of tradition in defending themselves against a new heresy.

The Canon proceeds, however, to criticism of the heresy. He does not attempt to deny that 'in one of thy tribes' may mean, or rather, after the analogy of the usage in the rest of the Code, must mean any of thy tribes. What he fastens on is the use of the definite article before the sanctuary, and there he denies that it could be used otherwise than for one definite place of worship. To quote his own words, he 'can find no adequate parallel case in which a noun with an article, followed by a defining relative clause of this type, can be treated as one of a class.'

I believed that 18<sup>6</sup>, which speaks of *the* Levite coming from any of thy towns to take up priestly duty at a sanctuary, proved the use of the definite article for one of a class; and therefore did not overload my previous article with further examples. Since this is not considered sufficient, perhaps because the Levite is not followed by a defining relative clause, it is necessary to quote others. Here are two, which have both been taken from the Deuteronomic Code itself.

In ch. 20, from v.<sup>10</sup>, the legislators give orders as to how Israel is to carry on war. In particular, the army is forbidden to cut down fruit-trees in the neighbourhood of any town which they are besieging. The law concludes in v.<sup>20</sup> with the permission to cut down other trees, and adds that the army shall lay siege 'to *the* town that makes war against thee, until it fall.' The town, which has appeared in vv.<sup>10, 19</sup> as a town without the article, now appears with the article and followed by a defining relative clause. According to the Canon the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses can only be one specific sanctuary, that at Jerusalem. Then the town which comes to war with Israel, must be some specific town, such as Ekron or Damascus. Accord-

ing to my view, the town of 20<sup>20</sup> may be any town which makes war on Israel. But that implies that the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses may be any sanctuary of this character.

An even more striking case occurs in 14<sup>21</sup>, because there a noun with the definite article and a qualifying relative clause stands alongside an indefinite noun which has no qualification. The Israelites are forbidden to eat a carcass from which the blood has not been drained. But it is added: 'thou mayest give it to *the* ger who is within thy gates, or to *a* foreigner.' Will the Canon require us to believe that there was only one specific ger to whom an Israelite farmer might make over his dead sheep? If so, it is to be feared that he will find difficulty in carrying that out in reference to every passage where the ger within thy gates is mentioned. Evidently the Law declares it to be legitimate to dispose of the carcass to any ger or to any foreigner. But, since the foreigner has no qualifying relative clause, he receives no article: since the ger is qualified, he receives an article.

Again, in course of proving that 'one of thy tribes' may mean any tribe, I appealed to 23<sup>17</sup>, which orders that a fugitive slave shall live in 'one' of the towns which he might choose as a refuge. This town might obviously be any town in Israel. König and Sellin retorted that the slave might certainly choose any town, but, after he had chosen it, it could be only one specific place. Hence, of course, Yahweh might choose any sanctuary, but, after He had chosen it, it could only be one. My reply was that the two cases were not parallel. In the nature of the case, the slave could only live in the place he chose, because a man cannot live in two places. To say, however, that Yahweh could only locate His name in one sanctuary was to beg the question at the beginning. And I added that to say that Yahweh could only locate His name in one sanctuary contradicts Ex 20<sup>24</sup>, where we read about every place where He records His name. The Canon, however, objects that this is no help, since Exodus speaks of every place, while Deuteronomy speaks only of the sanctuary. Yet my reason for quoting Ex 20<sup>24</sup> was that it does speak of every place. By so speaking, it implies the belief that Yahweh could record His name in several places. He could, therefore, make His name dwell in more than one. To say that He could not, means that Deuteronomy has moved away from the position of Ex 20<sup>24</sup>, and teaches that there is only one legiti-



mate sanctuary. And that, I repeat, is to beg the question at issue from the beginning.

Another example of the same kind of argument by begging the question is to be found in connexion with my reply to an objection brought forward by Gressmann. It would only be tedious to enter into full details. The matter involved was in connexion with the law about Passover. I acknowledged that Gressmann's objection would have force, if it were certain that this law was first issued as a law for all Israel. Since, however, I did not believe that the Code of Deuteronomy was issued for all Israel, and since I had given special reasons for regarding the law of Passover as one for Ephraim, his objection carried no weight against my position. But, writes the Canon 'how does he know that the passover law was for Ephraim only.' The retort is easy and obvious. How does the Canon know that the regulations of the Deuteronomic Code, and among them the law about Passover, were first issued for all Israel? He knows it, because he accepts the Wellhausen theory, which declares that Deuteronomy was drafted at the time of Josiah and was then issued to be the law for all Israel. Yet that is the very question which is under discussion. To determine it by principles drawn from the 'regnant hypothesis' is to attempt to foreclose discussion by authority. It is more remarkable to find such a position advanced by the Canon, because in a later passage of his article he says: 'In Deuteronomy we have a compilation of laws and groups of laws, probably laid down at different times, at different centres and by different authorities. . . . The laws about first-fruits, tithes and sacrifices may have originally required only that they should be offered at a local sanctuary.' It will be noted that, while first-fruits, tithes and sacrifices are here allowed to a local sanctuary, Passover is carefully excluded. Why? Is it possible that to include Passover would seriously endanger the Canon's whole position? Yet it is difficult to see why it should be excluded, especially when it is known about it that the law of Deuteronomy on the subject is not the same as that of Exodus, and that the law of Deuteronomy curiously resembles the practice of the Samaritans in the hill-country of Ephraim. Is there any analogous distinction between the sacrificial customs of old Israel which will justify the Canon in granting that the laws about these may have been connected with a local sanctuary?

It remains to ask whether anything has been

advanced to weaken my conclusions as to the other phrase, which occurs only in the section 12<sup>1-7</sup>, the sanctuary which Yahweh elects out of all your tribes. Here, naturally, the Canon finds no fault with my recognition that the passage can only mean centralization at Jerusalem. But he questions whether it is correct to make it later in date than the rest of the chapter in which it occurs. My reason for doing this is that vv. 1-7 regard the conquest as so complete that the Canaanites are wholly subject to Israel, and must submit in everything to the will of the conquerors. In the rest of the chapter, on the other hand, the Canaanites are living among the Israelites and are strong enough and numerous enough to present a real danger to Yahweh worship. Now these two views of the conquest are found in Joshua and Judges; and it is generally acknowledged that the idea of a complete conquest is the later and the less historical of the two. The Canon objects that this view of a complete conquest appears in passages of Joshua which are generally regarded as Deuteronomic, and also appears in certain sections inside our Book of Deuteronomy. But what real bearing has this on the question at issue? What is at issue is the relative date of two sections in the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy. In one of these appears a view of the conquest which is generally regarded as late, wherever it occurs, whether in Joshua or anywhere else. In the rest of the chapter we find a different view, which is also generally regarded as early, wherever it occurs. The two views are so incompatible that one writer could not hold them both at the same time. Especially they are so incompatible that a body of legislators could not base a law which is comprised in seven verses on one of them, and then proceed to base a new series of laws on the other. The only conclusion which seems reasonable is that the two sections of the chapter have been drafted by different men and belong to different periods.

What seems to have led the Canon to the above criticism is his evident conviction that to pronounce 12<sup>1-7</sup> later than the following verses implies that this little section is also later than the period of Josiah. At least he follows up his previous remarks by stating that, since I hold 12<sup>1-7</sup> to be later than the rest of the chapter, 'although he nowhere explicitly says so, Welch is compelled by the exigencies of his theory to range himself with Kennett and to throw overboard the trustworthiness of the account in Kings.' So little am I conscious that the exigencies

of my theory involve this conclusion that I have contributed an article to the forthcoming number of the *Z.A.W.* to prove the opposite. Hölscher and Oestreicher, for very different reasons, question the reliability of the account in Kings. They hold that Josiah made no effort at centralization and aimed merely at purifying the temple-worship. I have done my best to prove them wrong and to support in this matter the account in Kings.

Nor is it easy to see why the exigencies of my theory compel the conclusion of the Canon. One hesitates to add another hypothesis to those which have gathered round this significant and fateful period of Israel's history. Yet, if it were only to point out that my theory as to Deuteronomy does not involve the rejection of the account in Kings, it may be done. What interested and surprised me most in studying afresh the Code of Deuteronomy was to find how constantly it brings one back to conditions in Northern Israel. The law may have been originally intended for use in that kingdom. If so, it would go into captivity, when the kingdom was swept away, for at that time all the priesthood disappeared from the land. At a later date, however, an Assyrian king sent back a priest, at the request of the population in what was now one of the imperial provinces (2 K 17<sup>27</sup>). The man renewed the Yahweh-cult at the old shrine of Bethel. Since the purpose of his coming was to teach the people 'the manner of the God of the land,' he must have brought with him a rule or law which was adapted for this purpose. And no other was better fitted for the task he had to fulfil than the Code which had once been in force in this very district. The old ritual was restored at Bethel, and the old Code of Deuteronomy was again issued to guide the remnant Israelites. For, while the province had been stripped of its leaders and priests, the backbone of the population still largely consisted of the Hebrew peasants.

Now we have reason to believe that Josiah, seeing the weakness of the Assyrian government, tried to extend his authority beyond Judah over the Northern province and to bring back all Israel under his power. In this he merely followed the example of his predecessor, Manasseh. But, while Manasseh's plan was to weld together the Assyrian settlers and the old Israelite settlers by an amalgam of the Assyrian and Hebrew faith, Josiah sought to appeal to the native Hebrews in the name of their own religion. In the weakness of Assyria he could

afford to follow this policy. His aim, however, was partly political, and he therefore sought to turn the men's minds to Jerusalem, as the one centre for the true Yahweh worship. Centralization of worship at Jerusalem could serve alike a religious and a political end. Hence we find the king desecrating the altar at Bethel (2 K 23<sup>15</sup>), which is not the high-place of Jeroboam. It was the one Yahweh-shrine which remained in the Northern province, the place to which the priest from Assyria had brought back the restored cult. As such, it was the only centre of Israelite devotion and pride, which could in any way compete with Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup>

Yet the destruction of the altar at Bethel did not necessarily involve the destruction of all its sacra. Indeed, with the ideas of the holiness of all the sacred utensils which were prevalent at that period, such an action would have appeared a daring and useless sacrilege. It is remarkable how careful the historian in 2 K 23<sup>16ff.</sup> is to justify Josiah's conduct in desecrating the altar. Evidently there were men who were shocked and startled by the act, and it was necessary to show that the king in this was fulfilling a Divine command given by a prophet. The sacred vessels may rather have been transferred to Jerusalem, and with them would go the sacred books.

What happened to them there it is impossible to know. But it is not impossible that the Code of Deuteronomy was among these sacred books and fell aside in one of the Temple rooms only to be rediscovered at the famous repair of the Temple itself. There its discovery served the ends both of the court and the priesthood. They used it as a means for appealing to Northern Israel. They gave it full authority as one of the sacred books of their Law. But the priesthood were careful to preface it all with the opening section 12<sup>1-7</sup>, which set in the forefront of an otherwise dangerous code of law the command that Jerusalem was the one shrine for all legitimate worship. That would serve to explain why the section hangs loose where it stands, having no relation to all which follows. It would explain why it uses language about the sanctuary which has no parallel in the rest of the Code. And it would finally explain why the section makes an impracticable demand. The men were content to countersign the Law with a general command, which made it innocuous.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See another article in the December *Z.A.W.*

<sup>2</sup> I would add that at one time or another the sacred literature of Northern Israel was combined with that



But, further, if we could suppose that by some such means the Code of Deuteronomy was made part of Israel's law, but yet made subservient to the great aims of the court and priesthood at Jerusalem, a fresh and welcome light is cast on the work of Jeremiah. His famous verse about the false pen of the scribes working deceitfully (8<sup>8</sup>) does not need to be watered down and explained away. He means exactly what he says. To him the conduct of the court and priestly party seems unworthy in itself. But not only does this method of gaining their end seem unworthy; the end which they are seeking is bad in itself. To the court the centralization of worship at Jerusalem was a welcome means of restoring the unity of Israel through an appeal to the common religion. To the priesthood it appealed as a means of getting rid of the local shrines with their danger to the purity of the faith. Jeremiah is as well aware as any other of the abuses which attach to the bamothe and as unhesitating in condemning them. But he will have nothing to do with a cure which, while removing one evil, poisons the whole system.

For Jeremiah sees this question of centralization to be a means by which the Temple is made an of Judah. There are definitely Ephraimite psalms, such as 80 and 81 (cf. Gunkel's recent Comm.), which have been incorporated into the great psalter. The Northern book of history was joined with that of Judah. When was this done, and when was it felt to be necessary? I suggest that it was about the same time as the law of Ephraim was joined with the law of Judah. And it was probably done for the same purpose.

essential of true worship and the Yahweh religion is bound to stone and lime. Therefore, he goes up to the Temple, and in his great address declares that in the interest of true religion the Temple must go: Yahweh will deal with it as He dealt with Shiloh. From that hour too He announces that Chaldea must capture Jerusalem. It is Yahweh's instrument to destroy the things which men are counting essential to their religion. He writes to the captives at Babylon to bid them give up hankering after a return to their own land. Yahweh has sent them to Babylon in order that they may learn to do without a temple. He tells the priests at Jerusalem who call the exiles rotten figs, because they can no longer offer sacrifice, that it is they who are the rotten figs. The Prophet's political attitude and his religious teaching become a unity, when we recognize that they had a common source. And their common source was that the Temple was not essential for the true worshipper of Yahweh. Since the men would learn it in no other way, since they were making the only place where God could be rightly worshipped to be Jerusalem, Yahweh would teach them through the awful means of Chaldea's war. The holy and beautiful house, where their fathers had worshipped, and which they had desecrated through making it the only place where men might worship, should go up in flame. And in the villages round Jerusalem and in the settlements in Babylonia men would find that they could worship Him; for they should still go and pray to Him, and, praying, find Him as near as He had once been to Abraham.

---

## The Sacrament of Beauty.

BY THE REVEREND ALBERT D. BELDEN, B.D., WESTCLIFF-ON-SEA.

THE fundamental meaning of the word 'Sacrament' is a pledge or covenant, and the contention behind this title is that in all the beauty so prodigally distributed round our human life there is a pledge of the Love of God, demanding on our part an answering covenant of loyalty and service.

The term 'Sacrament' is mostly used to refer to the holiest rites of our faith, such as Baptism, Marriage, and Holy Communion; yet the very purpose of these sacraments is that all our life should become sacramental, and that every day,

in all the circumstances of life, we should be in Holy Communion with God—our consecrated service answering continually the Divine Love. Unfortunately there is grave danger, in this over-commercial age, of our missing the sacrament of beauty. One has only to consider the way in which we permit our lovely countryside to be disfigured by commercial advertisements to realize the inferior place that we still give to beauty in our time. Even in our towns and cities it is well-nigh impossible to get a fair, square view of

architectural beauties without finding that there is thrust athwart one's line of vision some glaring advertisement of merchandise. Even the light of the stars is quenched by flaming sky-signs of somebody's soap or soup! Great masses of our population are born and bred in conditions of revolting ugliness, and at an impressionable age are thrust into factories and warehouses—into a general commercial system with which the word 'beauty' has only just begun to be associated. All honour to the firms, curiously enough mostly connected with the confectionery trade, that have pioneered the conception of a commerce and industry that is beautiful. In the final ethic of humanity it will be enough to detect ugliness in a thing for it to be immediately condemned. Such instinct for beauty as we have already developed is sufficient to assure us that nothing can be Divine that is not beautiful. Even our favourite stories of 'ugly ducklings' are an indirect tribute to the absolute necessity and desirability of beauty of some kind in those we would revere—if not of face and form—then of spirit and disposition.

*The energy of beauty.*—Yet how true it is that in spite of the worst that man can do to create ugliness, beauty is for ever overcoming it. Above the miserable slum there is for ever stretched the changing panorama of the sky—the perpetual challenge of a Heaven that is mankind's true destiny; and ever the living green shoots its way through the dull earth to brighten this and that spot of desolation. How determinedly Nature flings her bright mantle over the ugliest ruin! The battlefields of Flanders and France are already decked with the glory of forget-me-not and poppy. There is a curious energy in beauty which causes it to flow into every nook and cranny that affords it the least opportunity, as though the power behind creation were the sworn foe of all ugliness and the sworn lover of the beautiful.

*The overplus of value.*—In his charming book, *Work, Play, and the Gospel*, Malcolm Spencer has defined beauty as nearly as it can be defined as always involving an 'overplus of value.' It is a most significant and rich definition. This surplus of value is evident everywhere in our human experience. We are beleaguered by beauty in a thousand forms. It allies itself to every one of our physical senses; and yet it yields to the soul a meaning that cannot be explained in terms of purely physical sensation. In every aspect that we call 'beautiful'

there is something that speaks directly to the mind and appeals for an appreciation that is distinctively spiritual.

*Taste.*—Think, for example, of the beauties of 'taste.' Our food, for the purposes of mere nourishment, might have been made just sufficiently tasteful to induce our interest, but we find that in most foods there is a relish that is exquisite. The lusciousness of fruit is a distinct overplus of value—something given over and above what is merely necessary. There is a curious story about Lord Tennyson which says that he was rebuked by a friend for his undue interest in a plate of well-cooked beef and vegetables. The Poet Laureate replied rather hotly: 'Every fine natured man knows what is good to eat.' It is well to realize that if we do not take our food with this appreciation of the beauty woven into its provision, we can scarcely avoid taking it sullenly and selfishly, and at last—gluttonously. If it is not a sacrament, eloquent with the Love of God, an offering of Divine Grace for which the 'grace' of human thankfulness should ever be forthcoming, it will be a ministrant to our lower passions and our worse self.

*The message of the flowers.*—Or think of the beauty of scent and of vision! The sense of smell is a great protection to the human organism, and those things that are not dangerous might conceivably have been provided with a merely in-offensive smell; but the fragrance of the rose! or sweet briar!—so glorious and extravagant!—what can be the meaning of that? Few things so quickly ally themselves to the spiritual side of human nature as does fragrance. It has a curious quickening effect upon memory—'rosemary for remembrance.' Is there any memory that it should quicken more powerfully than the remembrance of the Creator? Then, again, the plant life of the world might conceivably have been limited to green herb and foliage, just capable of exuding oxygen and imbibing carbon-dioxide. But why should it run to flowers? How does the utilitarian valuation appeal to us as we think of flowers? To some people they are a useless extravagance on the part of Nature, serving no practical value. 'You can't eat them!' Indeed, you cannot even sell them excepting as they make their appeal to something in man that is akin to Love. But that last fact is just the sublime truth about them. A friend of the writer who is a most successful florist has coined



the delightful advertisement : ' Say it with Flowers.' Have you ever thought of the things we say with flowers ? When we wish to insult our neighbour across the way, is it usual to send him a bouquet ? No—it is when we would make some great utterance of love towards a departed friend, or to one whose love we fain would win, that we find it the highest wisdom to ' Say it with Flowers.' Can there be any other meaning to this great overplus of exquisite value in Nature than that it is God's way to ' Say it with Flowers' too ? The message of the flowers is a Divine beneficence which rejoices in giving always an ' overplus of value.'

*Sound.*—What of the beauty of ' sound' ? There is no great reason why the sounds of the world, for all practical purposes, should not be limited to those of the ' quack quack' and ' moo moo' type, yet think of the difference between those sounds and the human voice at its best, whether in the speech of the great orator or the voice of a Madame Patti ! A friend of the present writer was once upon the verge of suicide. He had left his home for that purpose, but on his way to the river he passed the Town Hall, outside of which it was announced that a celebrated composer would give a recital upon the organ. Being a lover of music, he turned in to hear this famous man, and heard him play his greatest piece of music. By that marvellous alchemy of the human soul, which is such a happy mystery, the sounds that fell upon his ears translated themselves into a message for his bruised and beaten spirit, and saying to himself that ' a world that contains such beauty must be made for the triumph of love,' he went back to his tragedy to strive anew and to conquer. Saved by beauty !

*The hallmark of the beautiful.*—This overplus of value is the supreme characteristic of beauty because it is the element that gets past the senses to the soul. A capital instance of this is in our experience of love. The very meaning of love is something given—its very soul is generosity. ' Cupboard love' is no real love at all. If you felt that your wife was carefully and coldly calculating in her affection towards you, striving to preserve a strict balance of favours—if you discovered, for example, that she kept a little book in which she carefully noted every time you were kind to her, in order that she might not be kind to you for any extra number—then love between you would simply fall dead at your feet. It is the element of gener-

osity that is the very life, the very soul, of love—the something given, the overplus, the unnecessary thing—it is in that element that beauty consists. It is only a step from this realization to say that all the great virtues of Christian character are exquisitely beautiful, for they all contain this element of sacrifice on the part of the self, for the sake of another. Truthfulness, for example, is the conquest of all the advantage that the self might temporarily gain from falsehood, for the sake of the ideal welfare of humanity. This is why our souls are so deeply stirred by the story of a martyrdom for truth—our sense of beauty is appealed to directly. This too is the secret of the power of heroism to pierce all our customary and daily selfishness. Correspondingly every sin is intrinsically ugly because it is intrinsically niggardly, mean, pruned of all surplus value. If only the human soul could appreciate this fact to the full, it would come very near to redemption, for with beauty there is always power. There is an intrinsic relation between beauty and energy. If ever we should succeed in making the work of the world beautiful, we should tap in a supreme degree the full energy of humanity and discover a capacity for toil far beyond our present dreams. Beauty lays hold upon the supreme motive force of the soul. It captures the heart and draws forth the soul in its purest desire. We know this by personal experience. Frequently when we are deeply moved by some spectacle of fine character, as, for example, in a noble play or a powerful and wholesome novel, as out of the mass of misunderstanding and intricate plot and counter-plot human character emerges in some glorious triumph of endurance, mercy, or forgiveness, then we know supremely that this is ' the likeliest God within the soul' and the most perfectly beautiful thing in all our experience.

*Beauty's living soul of love.*—How near we come here to the very heart of the Christian faith ! Is there any other ' overplus of value' more wonderful in all our experience than the generous love for all men displayed in the Cross of Christ ?

Did e'er such love and sorrow meet,  
Or thorns compose so rich a crown.

In the mind of Jesus, His sacrifice was most closely allied to the ' beauty of the Lord our God.' Over and over again we find Him speaking of His coming self-offering as His ' glorification.' ' The hour is come that the Son of Man is to be glorified.' ' Ex-

cept a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth with itself alone: but if it die, it beareth much fruit!' The glory which He had with His Father 'before the world was' is this glory of Uttermost Love, this spirit of endless Self-Giving. No wonder, then, that when His Spirit truly possesses the soul, all beauty comes forth to greet it!

Heaven above is softer blue,  
Earth around is sweeter green,  
Something lives in every hue,  
Christless eyes have never seen.

According to Browning, it is just this revelation of the deep identity of beauty with Perfect Love that man needs if he is to understand Nature and receive her ministry. Looking at Nature he cries:

Wanting is—what?  
Summer redundant,  
Blueness abundant,  
—Where is the blot?

Beamy the world, yet a blank all the same,  
—Framework which waits for a picture to frame:  
What of the leafage, what of the flower?  
Roses embowering with nought they embower!

That is Nature as he sees it without the revelation of the Presence of Divine Love—all its beauty lacking in crucial effect, its meaning held in sus-

pense. Then his deep human need bursts forth in loud appeal:

Come then, complete incomplection, O comer,  
Pant through the blueness, perfect the summer!  
Breathe but one breath  
Rose-beauty above,  
And all that was death  
Grows life, grows love,  
Grows love!

What shall be our response to this Sacrament of Beauty? Can we meet it with less than the most conscientious devotion to the beautiful in every part of our life—in our worship, in personal appearance, in our homes and places of business, our villages, towns, and cities? If we would discover the secret of personal power and of corporate witness, we must pray the prayer of the psalmist: 'Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.' Shall all His works be beautiful and *His children* fail of that deep moral loveliness which is the Father's image reflected in them? God forbid.

We thank Thee, Lord, for this fair earth,  
The glittering sky, the silver sea;  
For all their beauty, all their worth,  
Their light and glory, come from Thee.

Yet teach us still how far more fair,  
More glorious, Father, in Thy sight,  
Is one pure deed, one holy prayer,  
One heart that owns Thy Spirit's might.

Let us keep the Sacrament of Beauty.

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

Tell me a Story.<sup>1</sup>

'Our fathers have told us the tale.'—Ps 44<sup>1</sup> (Moffatt).

LONG, long ago, about two hundred and thirty years ago, there was a little lad in France to whom all you wee people owe a huge debt you can never pay. And yet, perhaps, you never heard of him! Who was he? Well, his last name was Pirault. And his first? I am not sure: but I think it was Charles. Why? Because his father was called that. The father was a fairly old man when the boy was born, too old to be much good at games and romping and the like. Yet he loved his little lad with all his heart, and used to think all day long

of the glorious evening they were going to have together. For there was one thing he could do for the little man just splendidly—he could tell him the most marvellous, exciting, creepy stories. He didn't just read them, and he didn't only tell them, but he made them up, brand-new, lovely stories, and his laddie heard them all, the very first of anybody in the world. There he would sit as still as still, as quiet as a mouse (though a mouse isn't really quiet, try to go to sleep with one scurrying up and down the wall), hardly breathing, with great round eyes and listening with all his ears (though really he had only two, just like you, no more). And he heard—what do you think? Cinderella! and Tom Thumb! and Blue Beard! all made up for him! Now, you know how much

<sup>1</sup> By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.



you owe him. For, had there been no little Charles, you would not have had any of these.

Yet you don't need to be envious. For you have a Father, that wonderful Lord and Father we call God; and you are His own little lass or lad. And He has told you the best story in the whole world. And His isn't only pretending and just making up. It is all really real, and truly true, the glorious story of Jesus Christ. You know about the Baby in the manger; and the Boy who grew up in the little town. If you had asked where His home was, they would have pointed up a little back street. 'Go along there, till you come to a carpenter's shed, it is next door to that.' And then, the Lad in the Temple, when they lost Him that exciting day, and He wasn't one bit afraid. And the wonderful Friend who went about doing kind things. Never a woman had a sick lassie, but she ran to Him for help. And always He did everything He could for any one. It is far the best story in the world. And it was your Father who thought it out, and your Father who made it up, and your Father who gave it us. He told it to you. Wasn't it a lovely thing to think of Jesus Christ? And wasn't it kind of God to give you such a splendid tale all as your very own. Didn't you know that? Oh, but that is true. If there had been no Charlie Pirault, there would have been no Cinderella and the rest of them. And if there had been no you and me, we shouldn't have had the beautiful tale of Jesus Christ.

How? This way. I don't know if Charles Pirault was often ill. But, you know Stevenson's books? They are fine, aren't they, all thrilly and exciting, and make you feel something fizzy inside, rather like when you are drinking ginger beer. Well, one of the best of them was written because a stepson of his was ill, and bored with lying in bed, and tired of all his books and games and toys and pictures, sick of everything, and getting cross and tempery. And so Stevenson wrote the story to keep him interested, and to help to pass the time, and to make him forget about the pain, and be able to do far better. And you and I are ill, ill of sulks, and ill of peevishness, and ill of temper, and whole heaps of horrid things. And our Father told us the story of Jesus to help us to forget about these ugly things, and to give us something better to think about, and to make us feel ashamed of being grumpy and cry-baby, and to let us see how manly and unselfish and happy

and brave we can be if we like. Wasn't it kind of Him?

But are we listening to the story, you and I? Do we like it, are we really paying attention? I once knew a man who wrote a book for boys. He was called Ian Maclaren. And one day in his house I met him coming downstairs, carrying a lot of papers. 'I may as well burn this,' he said, 'it's my boys' story, and it's not a bit of use. My boy is in bed ill, and I've been reading it to him and he doesn't like it.' 'Nonsense,' I said, 'what makes you think that?' 'I know,' he answered, 'I know, because, while I was reading it, he fell asleep.' He was a little disappointed. And no wonder. And I wonder if we are disappointing our Father too. Are you asleep when He tells you this splendid story that He has thought out for you? Are you attending? Do you really like it? There isn't another half so good. So let us read it, and think about it, and love it, and it will make real men and women of us by and by, and boys and girls worth knowing now.

#### The Monkeys in the Angel Choir.<sup>1</sup>

'The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good.'—Pr 15<sup>3</sup>.

The 'Angel Choir' is in Lincoln Cathedral. I hope you will all see it some day. It is called the Angel Choir not because angels come down to sing in it, but because in it there are carvings of angels. There are also carvings of other things. I was very glad to find an imp amongst the angels. The people who carved that, thought the imps should have a chance. So do I. The imp is not the only thing. There are three monkeys in the Angel Choir. They are carved in wood on the end of a choir seat. There are three carvings, and they are like three chapters of a story.

The first carving shows two monkeys working a churn. It is not a modern churn, such as we see at a show, where a neat dairymaid turns a handle and the whole thing goes round. It is more like a tub on the floor. In it there is something at the end of a long handle, which the monkeys work up and down like a patent washer. There they are, two of them working away making butter. Beside them, on a dish, are some pats of butter that they have made. But where is the third monkey, and

<sup>1</sup> By the Reverend Cecil Nicholson, Orroland, Darwen.

what is he doing? He is behind some bushes. You can see his face through the foliage. You can also see his arm and his hand, and he is reaching out his hand, the sly and wicked monkey that he is, to steal a pat of butter. The other two are working to make butter, and he is stealing it.

The second carving shows us the three monkeys again. This time the thief has been caught, and what do you think? They are going to hang him, and the two monkeys who were working the churn have hold of the rope, and the poor little thief is looking very sad, and seems to be wishing very hard that he had never stolen that pat of butter. But, you know, it is no use, after you have done a thing, wishing you had not. Even if you say you are sorry, you can't undo it. I feel sure that little monkey said he was sorry, but he had to be punished, and the other two had to do their duty, and hang him by the neck until he was dead. Poor little monkey!

The third carving is about the funeral. There are the three monkeys again, but one of them is dead, and the others are giving him Christian burial. They are not just throwing him into a hole, saying:

Rattle his bones  
Over the stones,  
He's only a monkey  
Whom nobody owns.

'They are the mourners at the funeral, and they have to bury their companion, and they look as if they were sorry. They seem to be saying: 'Poor little chap! he will never play with us any more. What a pity that he hadn't more sense. Why couldn't he be content to work for his pats of butter? Why should he want to steal them? He won't steal any more. He's got to suffer for it now. May God have mercy on his soul.'

Why did those woodcarvers, so many hundreds of years ago, put those monkeys in the Choir? The story is that in the early days of the Cathedral, a certain man was appointed to the office of Precentor. He took the office. He drew the salary, but he never did the work. The precentor of a cathedral is the leading singer, usually a minor canon. This canon was always going off somewhere instead of being in his place. He was never seen in the Choir, but he always took his money.

The men who were carving in the Choir talked about it. They said it was a shame. They had to work for their wages, and he ought to be hanged

for drawing his money without doing anything for it. They could not hang him, but they did what they could. They carved him as the monkey who stole the pat of butter, and the carving is to this day on a choir seat in the Angel Choir at Lincoln.

There are four things to learn from this story. The first is that we all ought to try our best and keep on doing our work. The second is that if we neglect our work, we have no right to draw our wages. The third is that if we draw our wages without doing our work, somebody may see us and make an example of us. The fourth is that, if no one else sees us, God will. 'The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good.'

The monkeys in Lincoln Cathedral are in the Angel Choir, but God doesn't want any thievish monkeys amongst the angels in His heavenly choir.

### The Christian Year.

QUINQUAGESIMA.

Love, the Mirror of Immortality.

'Now we see through a glass darkly.'—I Co 13<sup>12</sup>.

'Through a glass darkly.' The phrase has almost passed into a proverb. What was the thought in St. Paul's mind when he wrote the words? Literally what he said was this: 'Now we see by means of a mirror in a riddle.' The Apostle imagines himself to be looking into a mirror—such as was in use in those days—made of burnished metal and not nearly as bright as our looking-glasses are now. Dimly in the mirror St. Paul sees a reflection, which he cannot fully discern. The reflected image is so shadowy and mysterious that it suggests to him the idea of a riddle or puzzle, which must be carefully studied before it can be made out. Such (he says) is the vision of the spiritual world and of the future life which is vouchsafed to our human faculties now. It stands in sharp contrast to the direct vision, the face-to-face vision, which will be vouchsafed to us hereafter. It is dim, puzzling, uncertain in detail.

So far the point of St. Paul's illustration is clear.

But what does he mean by the mirror itself? We might answer this question in more than one way: we might say that revelation is the mirror, or that faith is the mirror: we know from other passages in St. Paul's writings that he could have



accepted either of these interpretations. But here, if we could reach his inmost thought, we should probably find that his point of view was slightly different, and that by the mirror he meant human love. His mind at the moment is full of the beauty and pre-eminence of human love.

The idea that human love, and especially bereaved human love, may be regarded as a mirror which reflects the image of immortality is still full of suggestiveness. Love, it may be said, is no argument: a feeling is not the same thing as a process of reasoning: our affection for those who have gone from us is not enough, taken by itself, to prove their immortality. Yet is not love, after all, one of the links which finds a place in the chain of evidence for a future life? The evidence for immortality is cumulative. Our reasoned convictions, our instinctive beliefs, the testimony of conscience, and the voice of revelation all tell in one and the same direction, and the total value of these converging lines of evidence is far weightier than the mere sum of the separate arguments. Love supplies a witness of its own. Love gives us insight.

If we look into the mirror, what do we see?

1. Think of all the love and yearning which, generation after generation, have been felt by human hearts for dear ones lost. Can all this passionate feeling, we ask, have been poured out in vain? Is the loan, when God has reclaimed it from us here, never again to be restored in the world to come? The Christian admits that there is much of which he is absolutely ignorant about the state of the departed. He is content to be ignorant, provided that he can cling to the one all-important truth that they are alive, that they exist somewhere in the universe, and that, wherever they are, they are in God's keeping.

God of the living, in Whose eyes  
Unveiled Thy whole creation lies,  
All souls are Thine; we must not say  
That those are dead who pass away:  
From this our world of flesh set free,  
We know them living unto Thee.

Not spilt like water on the ground,  
Not wrapped in dreamless sleep profound,  
Not wandering in unknown despair  
Beyond Thy voice, Thine arm, Thy care;  
Not left to lie like fallen tree;  
Not dead, but living unto Thee.

2. As we look a second time at the image of the future life reflected in the mirror of love, we discern something else. Love refuses to be content with an impersonal immortality. It not merely rejects the thought of annihilation; it also rejects the thought of the absorption of the individual soul, whether into the Being of Nature or into the Being of God. It cries out for the continuance of personality. It yearns for the future recognition of the loved departed. Our Lord Himself after His resurrection invited the Apostles to recognize the persistence of His personal identity after death: 'Behold and see, it is I myself.' Love ponders over this saying, and asks whether our Lord will not permit us also to recognize hereafter those for whose company we long most keenly—those, *e.g.*, whom we have personally known and loved, or those great spirits of all time whose thoughts have influenced our lives, or those blessed saints, whether they lived long ago or recently, whose example we have revered and tried to follow. How this recognition will take place we do not know.

3. Look once more into the mirror. Bereaved love has a final and supreme test of its trustfulness to show us. To some people there comes the experience of a moment which is among the most poignant memories of their lives. Love stands sometimes by the grave of one to whose future it cannot for all its breadth of charity, for all its keenness of sympathy, look forward without some foreboding. Is it a mockery, an unreality, to speak of hope in such cases? Surely that is not so. Hope is exactly the thing which love then specially needs. Hope, however sure and certain, cannot amount to actual knowledge without ceasing to be hope; yet at the same time hope must be strong, if it is to be worth anything in the way of comfort. Love believed everything that was possible of the unrepentant, grace-resisting sinner while he was yet on earth; and after his death, love, if it cannot believe all things, still hopeth all things.

'Through a glass darkly.' In the light of the revelation of Jesus Christ we see with clearness and certainty the general outlines of the great truth of immortality. But the details are beyond our powers of vision: they are 'in a riddle.' Love yearns in vain for some direct communication from the dead, for some definite knowledge of their state. It broods over Dante's great poem, it listens to the *Dream of Gerontius* as interpreted by music, it scrutinizes the reports of the Society for

Psychical Research, it reads devotional books which profess to disclose the great secret. But in its heart of hearts love knows that all its efforts are vain.

'If you ask (said Ward Beecher) why God did not reveal more to us respecting the hereafter, I reply by asking why do not you explain something about the higher side of life to your dog? It could not understand you if you did, and we could not understand what relates to the future if God should explain it to us.' To the fantastic questions which people sometimes ask about heaven it is sufficient to reply, God knows. If we know that God knows, we know all that we need to know. We know, at any rate, enough about heaven for all practical purposes: we know that to attain it we need a spiritual preparation. We know that if we are to see God as He is, we must purify ourselves even as Christ is pure.

My knowledge of that life is small,  
The eye of faith is dim;  
But 'tis enough that Christ knows all,  
And I shall be with Him.<sup>1</sup>

#### FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

##### The Power of Words.

'Take with you words.'—Hos 14<sup>2</sup>.

This text at first sight appears startlingly defective as a guide to men who would approach their God. Micah speaks otherwise—'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' In the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah we have a still more elaborate demand for various services toward the unfortunate, as the only terms on which God will consent to man's approach. But here we read, 'Take with you—words'!

Words are often supposed to be futile things, and contrasted with deeds. It was Carlyle who identified the two, 'Cast forth thy Act, thy Word, into the ever-living, ever-working universe'; and, indeed, if they be the genuine expressions of the truth, they are never futile, but always charged with vital energy. Dr. Denney has said, regarding St. Paul's exhortation, 'comfort one another with these words,' that here the Apostle is balancing the greatest sorrow of life against words, but then they are words of eternal life. Such words are not

the alternative to character, but the expression of character; nay, they are part of what forms character and fixes it.

Three things are manifest as to the power of words in our religious experience.

1. *What they imply—a view of intercourse with God.*—Hosea has idolatry in mind as he writes this chapter, and the superstitious ritual of Israel's temple-worship. The two had this in common that they were founded on a non-rational conception of worship. The worshipper had in neither case any clear idea of the meaning of the service he performed. Indeed, it was characteristic of Semitic thought that such ideas were not necessary in the least. What was required was the performance of certain acts and the giving of certain offerings. The god who could prescribe and accept such worship was, so far as his intercourse with men went, essentially irrational. Either he was incapable of rational intercourse, a mere mass of prejudices backed by supernatural powers; or he was unwilling for it, holding himself apart from his creatures in a haughty superiority which demanded homage, but despised them too thoroughly to be further interested in their affairs.

But here was a new conception of God. He cared not for mysteries, but for meanings. He called them back from formalities to the simplicity and reality of speech. When men worship God, rational beings are in communion, and worship is the converse of mind with mind. This is a God who can be spoken with, and from whom men may count on an intelligent and patient hearing. With such a God simplicity and sincerity are easy, for we are sure of being understood. Therefore awe must not rob us of trust and of directness. For our worship we should indeed prepare ourselves by selecting our choicest thoughts; but we should bring to God also our worst and most deplorable, nay, even our most casual and unimportant. For this is not a recitation, it is an intercourse.

2. *What words reveal—the truth about oneself.*—It is for want of bringing our secret life to expression that we are so often self-deceived. All idol-worshippers and mere performers of a religious office come back from their devotions with their illusions undisputed. Those who would leave their illusions behind them must take with them words. For it is our own words that we have to bring, the words that have first been 'spoken in the inner man.'

<sup>1</sup> H. G. Woods, *At the Temple Church*, 176.



Speak what words are natural and true, and no others. Say that you are glad, and life is good and full of love; or say, 'Thy ways seem cruel to me, and the pressure of Thy hand too hard.' Say, 'O Lord, I love Thee, yet I love Thee not'; 'Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief.' Say, if you must, 'Except I see in His hands the print of the nails, I will not believe.'

Thus speech is an ordeal, and the command of the text implies self-examination. What words have we to bring? The answer will reveal what words are natural to us, and so will be a test of our growth or declension in the life of the spirit. When we try to state to ourselves what we are and what we desire most, we shall find startling revelations. Many states of mind are tolerable only until they are plainly and definitely expressed. The expression will reveal the wealth or poverty of what our hearts want to say, and so will reveal what has been happening in us. Some will find themselves utter strangers in the spiritual region; others will move in it as men walking in their home fields. When you come to words, you will at least know where you are.

3. *What they effect—a transformation of character.*—For this act of worship has the power not only of revealing, but of forming character. Words mark the point of change from the unpractical to the practical.

In our inner life much is necessarily vague, consisting of confused masses of feeling, embryonic forms of thoughts, broken ends of ideas hanging loose. Some of these must, of course, be left vague. Yet some are waiting for expression to render them immediately effective. To say a thing which we have hitherto only thought or half-thought, is to give it the force of a part of our active life, to put it in a position to tell definitely upon conduct. When the images of the imagination are focused, and our estimate of self, our sense of sin, and our feeling of need are clearly perceived, action is sure to follow. There is more in the idea of 'making phrases like swords' than a fine figure of speech. In literal truth 'Bright is the ring of words,' and a spirit that has found its true utterance will be irresistibly urged forward towards conduct. The prodigal in the story had spent many days and nights in general ideas of repentance, desire, and intention that came to nothing. At last he found the words 'I will arise and go,' and the words brought immediate action—he arose and went.

Thus religious utterance is one of the great forces that lead to right action. It is in the dreamy brooding silence, when we know not what we do, that we idle and sin. When we begin to stir our minds, to think clear-edged thoughts and pass definite judgments of right and wrong and to pronounce these judgments in speech, our will leaps forward at the sound of the word, and makes for righteousness.<sup>1</sup>

## SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

### Meditation.

'And Jacob was left alone.'—Gn 32<sup>24</sup>.

Out in the bustle and confusion of affairs, it often seems incongruous to be asking questions about the deepest things of the soul; but in the hours of quiet separation from outward contacts and activities, the most thoroughgoing and penetrating questions almost ask themselves. 'And Jacob was left alone.' He was alone when in his dream he saw the angels of God ascending and descending. He was alone when he wrestled until the breaking of the day for the Divine blessing. When 'he went on his way,' from the vision of the ladder onward to the end, it was in the strength of great experiences.

What are some of the things which are involved in meditation, and what is its outcome?

1. First, meditation means *times of retreat* into the privacy of our own souls. William Alger said: 'Our times want the brooding spirit. . . . It is all come-and-go, and no stay. The dischargers of power are multiplied out of all proportion to the generators of power. To overcome the world it is indispensable first to overlook the world from some private vantage-ground quietly aloof. Solitude is the foster-mother of sublime resolves.'

2. Meditation is a state in which *the mind is vigorously active*—alert to needs and responsibilities, and awake to the demands of truth. To meditate is to think—to think down into things, to think out through things, and to think to some rational purpose and conclusion. The same faculties which are employed in study, in reasoning, in deliberation, and in self-scrutiny, are in use, and no whit less in use, in the act of meditation. Only in meditating there is an implication of withdrawal from the noise and distraction of the world, that one may be alone with himself and free to

<sup>1</sup> J. Kelman, *Ephemera Eternitatis*, 61.

follow where his reflections may lead. There is the further implication that in meditating the topic is usually a religious one.

Dr. James Martineau takes a different view. 'Meditation,' he says, 'does not find for us our place in the known world, but loses it for us in the unknown. It puts nothing clearly beneath our feet, but a vault of awful beauty over our heads. It furnishes immediate perception of things Divine, eye to eye with the saints, spirit to spirit with God, peace to peace with heaven. In thus being alone with the truth of things, and passing from show and shadow into communion with the everlasting One, there is nothing at all impossible and out of reach.' Now there can be no doubt of the rare blessings which may come to one, or rather which surely will come to one, in the way of inward peace, of exalted and satisfying emotions, and of fresh insight and broadened views, through just opening the mind and heart to God, and lying still in His arms as a child falls back in a mother's arms, and letting Him calm the agitations of the mind and whisper His sweet secrets into the soul. But this is not the whole of meditation.

3. There are *two factors in all meditation*—God and the soul. The thinking which has to do with spiritual culture, and through spiritual culture with moving forward into partakership in the Divine nature, has always these two factors.

Involved in these two factors, and playing back and forth between them, there are any number of questions of vital import and pressing urgency. But the all-embracing and dominant factors are God and the soul. It is on these—their meaning and their relations—that we are to meditate, and by meditating to find the spiritual profit and comfort which we seek.

Consider some of the questions which will be sure to leap to the lips in a mood of deep, sincere, and earnest meditation. Who is God, and what does He mean to me? Who am I, and what does my life here on earth signify? Is the soul a fancy, or is it a reality? Is this life all, or is there another life out beyond? Has God manifested Himself in Jesus Christ, and has Jesus Christ through an experience of His loving grace demonstrated to my inner consciousness that He is the way, the truth, and the life? Is there something better and higher for me than I have yet attained? Are my faults and failings, my shortcomings and my easily besetting sins, as offensive to me as they ought to

be? Are love and truth the open highways of duty and service, as alluring to me as they might be expected to be to a disciple of the great Teacher and an heir of the everlasting inheritance? Am I measuring up to any worthy standards of character, and illustrating loyalty to the most commanding ideals and ends of life? Are my aspirations in line with the will of the Eternal Righteousness, and am I pursuing objects which have on them now and for evermore the Divine benediction?

There is no difference in kind between the deep religious experiences of mystics and the deep religious experiences of other Spirit-filled believers. The mystic comes into his peace, his submissive trust, his clarified vision, his exalted fellowship with God, his hold on things invisible to mortal sight, largely through his habit of meditation and the wise use of quiet hours. He knows the advantage of 'sequestration from the world.' This is largely the secret of a Thomas à Kempis and of a Francis de Sales; and it is also largely the secret of a David Brainerd and an Edward Payson.

In a passage in his *New England Tragedies*, Longfellow has put thoughts into the mouth of Wharton, the Quaker, which have not only a fitness to him, but a special bearing on the point here urged. This is what he makes him say:

Let us, then, labour for an inward stillness,  
An inward stillness and an inward healing:  
That perfect silence where the lips and heart  
Are still, and we no longer entertain  
Our own imperfect thoughts and vain opinions,  
But God alone speaks in us, and we wait  
In singleness of heart, that we may know  
His will, and in the silence of our spirits  
That we may do His will, and do that only.

He presses this on the strength of what has been said before:

And as the flowing of the ocean fills  
Each creek and branch thereof, and then retires,  
Leaving behind a sweet and wholesome savour;  
So doth the virtue and the life of God  
Flow evermore into the hearts of those  
Whom He hath made partakers of His nature.

In the first of these selections we have the ideal of open-mindedness toward God. It is the Mystic



or Quietist conception of the proper attitude to take, if we would have the peace that passeth understanding, the guidance we need from on high, and the blessed assurance that makes one brave and true in all the exigencies of life. It is the mood of 'inward stillness' in which it is easy for the child to receive what the Father has to give. In the second selection we have the explanation of it all. Those who exemplify this 'perfect silence,' this 'singleness of heart,' and 'do His will,' have had their lives made channels through which the life of God could flow. They were not born—they were new-born—into this state. They opened their minds to God, they surrendered their wills to His will, and they co-worked with Him in His making them partakers of the Divine nature. Notice how Wharton puts it:

Let us, then, *labour* for an inward stillness.

This 'inward stillness' will not come of itself. There must be an intellectual and spiritual outreach for it, an opening of the mind to receive it; or a distinct effort to realize this attainment of acquiescence and joy in the Divine will.

So we come back to the proposition in hand, that meditation—meditation on God and the soul—habitual, severe, and often prolonged, is not alone a method, but an essential condition of progress and joy in spirituality. We must think on these things.<sup>1</sup>

### THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

#### The House without a Tenant.

'When he is come he findeth the house empty, swept and made ready.'—Mt 12<sup>44</sup>.

There are some people, and very charming people they are to listen to, who never see things dryly or abstractly, but always in pictures. That was Luther's fashion; sitting over the supper table with a friend or two, he would discuss the gravest matters of faith, and the ways of God, and the fortunes of the Church, but he never left these hanging in the air; he brought them close to life by some story about his children, or his servants, or his garden—something homely, and tender, and intelligible. That was Bunyan's way, and the whole world is in his debt because of it. He did not deliberately sit down to make an allegory, it came of itself, for it was so his mind worked. He

confesses that the *Pilgrim's Progress* was not the kind of book he had meant to produce:

For thus it was: I, writing of the way  
And race of saints in this our gospel day,  
Fell suddenly into an allegory  
About their journey and the way to glory,  
In more than twenty things that I set down;  
This done, I twenty more had in my crown,  
And they again began to multiply  
Like sparks that from the coals of fire do fly.

No gift could be more enviable for a popular teacher, since it arrests attention and secures that even the plainest folk can understand; and in our Lord Jesus we find this gift supremely. He did not need to manufacture parables, but found them coming as naturally as flowers burst from the stem at the pushing of life within. Whatever He was speaking of—virtues, temptations, mysteries, powers—He would always, before He was done, put the essential meaning of it in a phrase or story which would stick. Besides the completed parables there were images and metaphors in His talk, which might have been elaborated if He had cared; and it is with one of these we wish to deal.

There was a house, said Jesus, which, by misadventure, had fallen into evil hands, and had grown disreputable and foul. The owner, moved with shame, turned the tenant out, and set about the task of reclamation. He swept and scraped it, floor and wall and ceiling; he restored the roof, and mended the windows, and put locks on the doors, grudging nothing of trouble and expense. But then he ceased; and chiefly, he took no steps to find a tenant. The scandal was at an end, and that was enough. The owner, who had considered everything else, had given no thought to the finding of an occupant, and thus his trouble went for nothing. That is Christ's serious hint about the management of life.

1. We must not think that Jesus in any way disparaged the achievement of getting the house clean. On that His mind was set, only He aimed at it in a particular order: He first helped men to admit the thought of God's love into their hearts, as He believed that that would of itself expel the older mischiefs. He warned them not to wait until they felt themselves fit for God's arrival, and told them that His coming in itself is the beginning of fitness. In all His preaching,

<sup>1</sup> F. A. Noble, *Spiritual Culture*, 197.

gospel came before law; but He did not therefore reckon the banishing of a degrading habit as without importance. He calls it here the going out of an unclean spirit, a task for which only the power of God could be sufficient.

The people He addressed were Pharisees, whose temper and practice in religion were marked by ugly faults, but in justice we must remember that the alternative had been uglier still. The nation had been settling down into the slough of paganism. Greek fashions in language, in dress, in amusements, in morals, had been spreading, and a lazy kind of toleration, which took a pride in being shocked at nothing, was infecting priest and people. If the nation were to be saved, it must be by some drastic remedy, and that was found in Pharisaism, which drew the Hebrews out of their tainted associations, and set them as a people dwelling alone. Jesus often spoke with indignation of what it had become; but here He admits that, in its beginning, there had been the casting out of a devil, a movement in the direction of righteousness for which any nation might give thanks.

In Christian history this has many parallels—impulses which, at the outset, were laudable, though they were too soon exhausted. In Greek Christianity, for example, the message of the Incarnation broke in, with a kind of holy violence, upon minds possessed with unworthy thoughts of what God is like. Egyptian Isis, and Syrian Astarte, and Aphrodite the delight of gods and men, and Dionysus with his crew of revellers—these and others like them had borne the name of God, until Jesus Christ came with His Cross, the Lord of the burning heart; and the evil spirits slunk ashamed away. Greek Christians lost themselves in endless speculation and debate; they gave more time to discussion of the mystery of Christ's nature than to the humble imitation of His temper. But none the less, that breaking of the idols was a true work of God; it was a cleansing of the house, which had been urgently required.

Some of ourselves have achieved no great thing in our lives, and yet there was a real Divine beginning. A penetrating phrase served to prick the bladder of our conceit so that we knew our size; some vision of holiness made us ashamed of what we were, so that we started forth on a fresh plan of existence; there was a new seriousness and openness of mind, the dislodging of old habits and an honest desire for clear beginnings. Such an experi-

ence may have remained as a prophecy unfulfilled, and yet we must not despise it; for it was reformations of this kind, precarious and ill-secured, which Jesus had in view when He spoke of the unclean spirit going out of a man. They are works of God, He would have said.

2. But they are precarious. A clean house is good, but if it is to continue clean a right tenant must be found. So long as the best you can say of a man is that he is not bad, you can never be confident about him; he needs beyond that to become frankly and energetically good. 'Tranquillity is a good thing,' says Bengel, 'but it is not far removed from danger.' In the moral world there cannot be any mere neutrality, since positive forces are always pushing to the one side or the other.

Jesus, as His manner was, conceived of the forces which threaten every life as if they were real persons. Look, He says, at that outcast figure, which is a passion dethroned; he is moving restlessly over the earth, seeking a place to settle down in, and not finding it. He never can find it, for there is no enduring rest except in God, and he is against God. But uneasily he wanders night and day, he and legions of others like him, peering in at unblinded windows, rattling at every door. That is in the world you inhabit, says Jesus, that restlessness of exiled powers; and it threatens your life if that still is unpossessed:

For our comfort it may be said that there are other forces seeking also entrance: 'the Spirit which God made to dwell in men yearns for them jealously,' says James. He seeks to occupy every heart, and to create within it desires and purposes which are holy. Every life on earth is beset by these competing powers; but just because they are competing, there is no stability for the man who is willing to yield himself up to neither.

It may be that some former evil returns upon him, a habit reasserting itself, or a passion flaring up once more. Very often, as in the Pharisees, it is not familiar mischiefs which appear, but, in their stead, faults unthought of and thus unresisted. Censoriousness came in to lodge in their minds, and harshness toward the erring, and a display of piety in tone and phrase found shelter in that empty house where love had not been installed. But before the end, uglier spirits than these appeared—conspiracy and false swearing first,



and then murder slipped in for a night. For there is no checking the stream of sinister guests who may find their way into a vacant heart.

Ah, says Jesus to all of us who hear Him, your life will not be safe until it is occupied by One strong enough to hold these enemies at bay; and to Him you must give up your heart without reserve. There is no help in a vague interest in religion, in what Coleridge calls 'our slothful loves and dainty sympathies'; that is not the stuff of which good men are made. 'No virtue is pure,' says Sir John Seeley, 'which is not passionate; no character is safe which is not enthusiastic.'

There is no possibility of a middle course; and he who chooses for God must choose with undivided heart.

This is the claim the Master makes, when He seeks admission to our lives. 'Behold, I stand at

the door,' He says, 'and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in.' After He has once entered there is much to learn and to unlearn, much to amend and to purify, and some of us are constantly interfering with His control; but, in a true sense, safety comes with His arrival, and the peril of the empty house is past. As John says, 'He that was begotten of God, even Jesus Christ, keeps that man, and the evil one touches him not.' 'The first and great commandment is to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, and mind.' So the best of all preparations for duty or for privilege is in sincerity to say:

Oh, come to my heart, Lord Jesus,  
There is room in my heart for Thee!<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Macgregor, *Repentance unto Life*, 82.

## New Testament Criticism in Relation to the Christian Religion.

BY PROFESSOR W. MANSON, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

### II.

As regards St. Paul, it will readily be admitted that, in the peculiar working out of his system of theology, auxiliary ideas both of Jewish and of Hellenistic-Oriental provenance played an important part. The Jewish conception of the Divine righteousness gave Paul a language by which to think out the Christian principle that 'Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.' The language of Hellenistic-Oriental mysticism gave him a form in which to present the relation of the redeemed soul to the Redeemer-Lord. Yet these elaborations affect only the superstructure which Paul built on the Christian foundations: neither Jewish legalism nor pagan mysticism created the Christian experience itself. Let us, if you will, regard the equations which can be made out between Paul and Judaism or between Paul and the mysteries as a time-element, the silt which a developing process has brought with it. We can, I think, clear away this silt, and show what solid foundations exist underneath. Not to speak of

the extent to which St. Paul's 'Judaistic' pre-suppositions can claim the support of universal and ever-renewable experiences in the domain of the soul's relation to God, or of the extent to which the language of mysticism is unavoidable in any inward statement of the Christian relation to Christ, St. Paul's own statements, carrying back the initial truths of his theology to the apostles or to the Lord, are convincing and sufficient evidence of the real sources of his inspiration. On his own showing, the faith which he preached from his conversion onwards was the same faith which once he destroyed: the principle, so central to his system, that 'Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures' was one which he had 'received': the doctrine that Christian men are made right with God not by legal works, but by faith, is appealed to as common-ground between him and Peter, as Christian matter of fact which needs only to be mentioned in order to be conceded. In the light of these personal pronouncements of Paul, and with all due respect to the individuality and thoroughness of mind with which he wrought the

principles out, it is surely unreasonable to speak of Paul's singularity within the early Church, and not rather of his solidarity with the rest of his brethren. St. Paul—it comes to this—even in the most characteristic working out of his ideas represents not a break-away from the early Christian direction, but the central, summit wave of the movement, the wave which rose highest and has washed farthest on to future shores. His contemporaries were behind him in realizing the far-reaching logic of their position, but their position was not therefore essentially different from his.

It is not possible within the limits of this lecture to go into the whole question of St. Paul's relation to Christianity and to Christ. What can, and, I think, ought to be said is that while not all of Paul can be included in the Christianity which was before him, nevertheless his system is built perpendicularly upon the historic Christian foundations. His reasonings regarding the Atonement are only the further working out of what was already given in the primitive Christian postulate, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. In other words, Paul starts with the Cross of Christ, and in all that he says about sin, and law, and the conditions of Divine forgiveness he is really arguing backwards from that Cross as a *datum* of Christian history. In the same manner the Pauline conception of life ἐν Χριστῷ, while it may possibly owe something to the prevailing tendency to mysticism, is on Paul's own showing synonymous with the life which springs from faith in the Crucified. These are important recognitions. Having determined the Christian character of the basic presuppositions of Paulinism, we are in a position to deal with the Pauline superstructures, and to give them the value which belongs to them. This means just the value which they possess in the eternal nature of the Christian experience of God. Hence the merely 'Jewish' and merely pagan elements, if such exist, need not trouble us.

Perhaps this solidarity of St. Paul with original Christianity is most clearly seen in his identification of the Spirit, by which Christians live, with the personal Christ. I need not enter here into the causes which obliged Paul to circumscribe so carefully the nature of the supernatural principle to which Christians looked for guidance and help. Suffice to say that Paul found his converts threatened by false analogies from the ethnic religions by which

they were surrounded, and which also recognized the principle of pneumatic inspiration, and that he had therefore to safeguard the special character of the Christian πνεῦμα. This Paul does partly by proclaiming that the Spirit is a moral, as opposed to an anarchic, principle, partly by setting the Spirit in its proper antithesis to the flesh. But most of all Paul does it by always and everywhere associating the Spirit with Christ, and by definitely orienting the spiritual life to the Cross as to a moral centre. St. Paul would have agreed with the teaching of the Fourth Gospel that the Spirit of God in Christian experience does not create a new or special consciousness of its own, but always and everywhere a consciousness of Christ. Now this position is interesting not only as revealing the historical foundations of St. Paul's peculiar mysticism, but as suggesting that his knowledge of Christ was circumstantial, far more so than is ordinarily supposed.

It comes, as it seems to me, to this. It is incredible that St. Paul, working in so free a field and with so naturally mystical a bent, should have transferred the emphasis in his teaching from the Spirit to the Lord, if in the Lord he did not recognize the concrete lineaments of the Jesus who had lived and taught upon earth. His exchange of terms is obviously from the abstract to the concrete, from the purely mystical to the definitely historical. It is not apparent why he should have substituted the Lord for the Spirit, if his Christ were the theological abstraction which he is commonly represented to have been, for in that case his choice would have had little latitude. It is true that St. Paul draws a certain distinction between the 'Christ according to Spirit' and the 'Christ according to flesh.' His Christ κατὰ πνεῦμα transcends and completes the Christ κατὰ σάρκα, but while He thus transcends and completes Him, He does not therefore unmake or remove Him. Therefore, without going so far as one of my Canadian friends who holds that St. Paul may have been the actual source of a great part of the special matter of St. Luke's Gospel, I would regard it as practically certain that he was well acquainted with the Church's traditions regarding Jesus, and that he subsumed these in his thought of the spiritual Christ.

The question regarding St. Paul's relation to primitive Christianity is thus on a fair way to being settled. There remains the question of primitive



Christianity's relation to Jesus, and to this subject our attention must now be transferred.

### III.

People are saying to-day, Why trouble with St. Paul at all? Why not drop him altogether, and go back to Jesus Himself, by which they generally mean, go back to the teaching in Galilee, back to the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount? Now if this means, go back from a Christ who is a theological abstraction to one who was clothed with flesh and blood, and who lived an historical life, the principle, as we have seen, is already conceded by Paul. Paul identifies the Spirit with the Lord, and therefore the teaching of Jesus, as well as His death for sins, is a norm of the spiritual life. But if the modern cry 'Back to Galilee!' means, Back to a Christianity which consisted of purely ethical teaching, without any reference to Him who was its centre, the sufficient answer is that no such Christianity ever existed, or at least that none such is on record. The Christian religion, in the form in which we know it from the beginning, started not from Galilee, or from the Sermon on the Mount, but from Jerusalem, from the Upper Room and the Cross. Its Jesus—the real historic Jesus—was one who had not only taught and laboured, but who had died on Calvary, and dying had drawn the faith of His followers from temple, and from sacrifices, and from law to Himself. Unless we rule out all developments taking place in Jesus' life subsequently to the Galilean mission, we have no warrant for making Christianity originate in the Galilean ethics. Indeed, to do so is to leave Christianity suspended in the air. We may, I think, go further and say that primitive Christianity not only did not, but could not have lived purely by Jesus' teachings, if only for the reason that the traditions of these teachings which were available did not contain any sufficiently visible principle of unity within themselves. Even to-day scholars are baffled when it comes to comprehending the Synoptic data within the limits of any single formula, whether of an apocalyptic or of any other kind. Plainly the force behind early Christianity was not a programme but a Person. The Jesus, who had died, but who had returned to His followers in visions, prophecies, and revelations of Himself, alone gave unity to Christianity. In this scheme of life the teachings of Jesus, the Sermon

on the Mount, and the Galilean history have, of course, their place. They are an expression of the living Jesus, an instrument and organ of His Spirit. They are not *per se* the source of the Christian life, as our advocates of the 'Back to Galilee' cry are apt to assume, but simply a determining mode of the whole consciousness which is associated with the Christian Lord.

The great question in this field is, of course, whether the Messianic faith of the early Church goes back to the consciousness of Jesus, a point about which there is some dispute. Personally, it seems to me that the controversy is largely one about words rather than about real things. Even if Jesus Himself never employed Messianic language or allowed its use by others, even if He never drew to Himself any of the prophetic passages or imaginative symbolism of the Old Testament, some kind of language was necessary by which His followers could explain to themselves the nature of the religious experience which had come to them in Him, and which was inseparable from Him. But even if they, not He, first uttered the word 'Messiah,' they were still only registering an existing religious reality, not adding to or creating it. We cannot too often remind ourselves how very indeterminate and inconstant a quantity the Jewish belief in the Messiah was. We deceive ourselves if we think that in Jesus' time the name of the Messiah was trembling on every lip. If Jesus by the sheer force of His spirit had not created the substance of His followers' religion and pushed them beyond the confines of all ordinary language, it is hard to imagine that these followers would have thought of the nomenclature on which they finally united. Something very concrete and extraordinary, like the passion and the blood of Jesus, was necessary to evoke so shadowy and unsubstantial a revenant as the Messianic idea. But the scepticism which denies to Jesus what it concedes as possible for His followers is surely overwrought. It does not appear why Jesus in the course of that wondrous life with God should not have come to the point where only the Old Testament language about the One who was to bring the Kingdom of God could explain His own mysterious fortunes at the Father's hands, and, above all, His extraordinary engagement to bring His nation to God. That this engagement, springing from Jesus' unique sense of the love of God, was the *prius* of the Messianic vision, and not the

Messianic vision the *prius* of the redemptive passion, seems to me certain. At any rate, such a view, which carries the Messianic vision back to the later stages, at least, of Jesus' own consciousness, consorts better with the later creed of His followers, and would seem to be required upon any reasonably objective view of the evangelical tradition.

The thing we have to grasp is that Jesus set up in the souls of His followers a religious movement of infinite consequence, which required climactic language. This is a point on which most modern books dealing with the early Christian development seem to me inadequate. Early Christianity has been treated from the standpoint of its Christological concepts, which were mostly borrowed and inadequate. It has been treated from the standpoint of its public activities, which were worthy but not fully indicative of its essence. What has not been adequately treated is the history of the Christian soul, the spiritual experience which finds expression in words like: 'He loved me, and gave himself for me'—'He died for our sins according to the Scriptures'—'He sitteth at the right hand of God in the glory everlasting.' If we can fathom and explain these convictions, all that follows of faith in Christ—His Messiahship, His Lordship, His eternal Sonship, His identification with the Logos—becomes intelligible. The gulf between Christianity and Jesus will have been bridged.

And, indeed, a thorough sifting of the early Christian materials would seem to involve the carrying back of these convictions to the direct impact of Jesus upon the souls of men. When we come to Jesus, certain facts emerge which, upon any just evaluation, must be regarded as constituting an irreducible minimum of historical certainties.

1. Jesus brought to men a new experience of the living God, uttering itself in the cry, 'Abba, Father.' This is what the Christian tradition means when it says that Jesus at baptism received the Spirit of God, and heard the voice: 'Thou art my Son, the beloved, the object of my desire.' Jesus Himself, baptized with the Spirit, touched by the power, kissed by the love of God, is the beginning of Christianity. Accordingly, when Jesus preaches, men are amazed at His authority, His power over the spirit of man, for He speaks not like the scribes from a book, but straight from the heart of the truth itself. There arises in human hearts a new God-consciousness of which Jesus is the fount. With this there comes an orientation

of the religious life, no longer to tradition, but to God as revealed in experience. Jesus found on the statute-book old principles like 'Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth,' which went back to the desert, and which but for the codification of Israel's laws in a holy book would have gone the way of all obsolete things, but whose retention in the holy book was fatally retarding the soul of Israel. Jesus struck away these obsolete things. He broke through the sacrosanct book, and opened a way for the Spirit. He removed the fatal arrest which legalism had imposed on men's spirits. He put forward the hands of the clock until the ideal of human duty chimed again with the holy love of God. All this is history, and creative history, and I cannot but feel that Dr. McGiffert is wrong when, in his recent work, *The God of the Early Christians*, he seems to deny it. If Jesus laid any foundation at all, it was through and in a new realization of the Divine Fatherhood. St. Paul confesses as much when he says: 'God has sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.' Here you have the natal cry, the primordial recognition of Christianity. And with the Lord's Prayer daily upon Christian lips, I do not see how it could have been otherwise.

2. The task to which Jesus gave Himself, and in which He realized His calling, was the reconciliation of His nation to God. It was to save 'many,' *i.e.* as many as He could, that He preached and taught, laboured, hungered, and suffered, and it was on the same mission of reconciliation that He sent the Twelve. Jewish scholars, while contending that the ethics of Jesus may be paralleled from Rabbinical sources, admit that to this fundamental redemptive passion of Jesus there is no Jewish parallel. Here, then, we strike a second historic foundation of the Christian religion. The history of the Christian Church has been written from the standpoint of its apocalyptic visions and of its Messianic cryptograms, but I believe that the mission to humanity was more central, more constitutive, and more original than any of these.

3. The Christian society could never from the start dissociate the new experience of God and the new passion for humanity from the personality of Him through whom they came. They called Jesus the Messiah, the Anointed of God, because no other language was adequate to His transcendence. But it is important to grasp on what experiential basis this historic language was moulded



and riveted. In the soul of Jesus the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament came into position through His determining and inalienable consciousness of being sent to save His nation. In the faith of His followers the Messianic language signified the confession that this salvation was real. Nor could these followers, in virtue of that consciousness, ever think of Jesus' functions being alienated, or of His place ever being taken by another. Jesus was and remained the final messenger of God. Such a conviction, welded and annealed on Jesus' word and spirit, was, it is clear, primordial, coeval with Christianity.

4. 'Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.' It is quite certain that this conviction which came to constitute the finally determining aspect of Jesus' Messiahship, was also present in the natal consciousness of the Church. We have seen that there is no New Testament Christianity in which it is not the central, indeed the characteristic, element. The death of Jesus, which was at first the darkest of all mysteries, became very soon the focal point of light. From saying, 'Though He was the Messiah, He was crucified,' they came to say, 'He is the Messiah, just because He was crucified.' What was the specific experience which enabled this transition of thought to be accomplished, and made the Cross for ever the fascinating centre of all interest? I need not speak here of the objective significance of the death of Jesus as an event standing between the followers of Jesus and the world, nor of its ethical significance as marking the contrast between the Messiah's Kingdom and the kingdoms of the world, or as annulling earthly dreams of glory. Another direction of mind was implicitly present from the start, a pathway starlit by flashes of Jesus' own thought, in the conception that His death was part and parcel, nay, was the final and all-determining element, in that reconciliation of the 'many' to God, which Jesus came to effect. His death a ransom? His blood the sign or seal of a new covenant? These spear-pointed flashings of spiritual prediction on Jesus' own part were too consistent with the tenor of His whole life not to draw the eyes of His followers to them, and not to fill the foreground of their thought. So as they stood face to face with the fact of the Cross, some glimmering of what that whole reconciling life had meant gave guidance to their spiritual instincts. Gone to God for us? Giving Himself for the sins of Israel? Faith felt that it might indeed embrace that

thought. As they pondered the mystery, the followers of Jesus realized that something had happened. The veil of the temple had been rent in twain. Faith and hope had transferred themselves from temple and sacrifices and law, and rested on the head of the Crucified.

5. Jesus brought to men, and founded His Church upon, the assurance of immortality. The specific form of His message was the Jewish idea of the world-displacing, world-renewing Kingdom of God, for which apocalyptists looked. There was much in this Jewish idea which was natively and naively contingent and time-conditioned. The Jewish conception was largely a protest against the culture and institutions of the civilized world. But at the heart of the dream of the imperial glory of God there was something more. There was the dream of resurrection, the passion for what we call immortality. I believe that in the century and a half preceding Christ, and in the century and a half that followed Him, this quest of immortality was the predominant passion, and that the Jewish belief in the Kingdom of God was but the characteristic national form of it, a form in which the purer spiritual element was still involved in much crude matter. And what Jesus did, while carrying forward the form of the Jewish idea, was to liberate the spiritual substance, and to give it wings. The emphasis in Jesus' teaching is not on the material nature of the Kingdom, but on the quality of that life with God which is its condition and its inner essence. So that what Jesus gave to His followers, along with the conception of the life with God, was the assurance of immortality, as founded on Himself, and above all on His passion and death. I would stress this point at the close of our survey of the Christian foundations. I cannot but think that much of the emphasis which modern scholars have placed on the outward form of Jesus' eschatology is largely mistaken and unwarranted. Jewish scholars are not greatly troubled by the apocalyptic element in the literature of Israel. It is only when Western minds, accustomed to the external and prosaic valuation of ideas, get to work on the symbolism of the primitive faith that we lose touch with Jesus.

And so, beside the principle, 'He died for our sins according to the scriptures,' rises the other and complementary principle, 'He sitteth at the right hand of God in the glory of the Father.' On these foundations everything else is built.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Isaiah xxx. 7.

'And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, *shall be grass with reeds and rushes*' (Is 35<sup>7</sup> A.V.).

THIS verse presents a very interesting problem. Its main difficulty is concerned with the word paraphrased as 'where each lay' and supposed to be derived from the root רָבַץ ('lie down'). Against this is the impossibility of making any accurate translation, which has led recent editors to regard the passage as hopelessly mutilated, and to put forth drastic suggestions as to what may have been its original form.

The difficulty is complicated by the strange fact that three of the most important words are found in a single verse of the previous chapter (34<sup>13</sup>). These words are *dragons* (? jackals), *habitation*, and *court*, the last word being rendered *grass*, but it should probably bear the same meaning in both passages, even though 'court' makes no sense in this verse.

An explanation must be sought for this strange repetition. Some scholars have suggested that the whole of the verse as found in the previous chapter ought to be incorporated, but this suggestion does not take account of the difference of outlook between the two chapters, the earlier describing a scene of desolation, and the later chapter speaking of restoration. Thus, while dragons, or more probably jackals, are in place in chap. 34, they are certainly very much out of place in chap. 35, the very next verse to that in which they are now found stating that 'no lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon.' If it be said that what is intended is that jackals have gone, and that reeds and rushes have taken their place, it can only be said that the jackals might very well have stayed in such excellent cover. Hence the conclusion seems inevitable that these three words form an interpolation, and as such must be struck out.

But the question, a very important question, has still to be asked, viz. assuming their interpolation, how was it that they came to be introduced? The answer is this: they were introduced because of the word now rendered 'where each lay,' but which is literally 'her lying down.' What lay down? Apparently nothing lay down, so suitable creatures were, quite cleverly, introduced from the previous chapter!

Now that they have gone, it will be seen that the crux of the problem lies in the word רִבְצָה, which must now be examined. What is suggested is the simplest and most ordinary confusion of letters, viz. that between *resh* and *vau*. Thus for רִבְצָה read רִבְצָה. Now the word רִבְצָה ('marsh') occurs in two passages of the Book of Job. In Job 8<sup>11</sup> it goes with the word here rendered *rushes*, and in Job 40<sup>21</sup> with the word here rendered *reeds*. There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that it occurs here also, and that the translation of the whole passage should be as follows:

And the parched ground shall be a pool,  
And the thirsty land springs of water,  
And a marsh with reeds and rushes.

This emendation suggests certain very important reflections.

(1) The first of these is concerned with the ancient edition of the Hebrew text of this book. It is evident that those very early scholars took great liberties with the text. That this happened long before the M.T. recension is shown by the LXX, which apparently had בְּנוֹה תְּנִים, though rendering it as 'a joy of birds,' and חֲצִיר, which it renders by *ἐπαυλὶς* by which it renders חֲצִיר in 34<sup>13</sup>. This conclusion, confirmed by many other passages, warrants an inference of the greatest possible significance for textual criticism, viz. that a large number of textual errors are not due to long transmission, but to faulty scholarship, and to the misreading of consonants. If this be the case, restoration is far more likely than if the errors encountered were due to the mere carelessness of copyists.

(2) The second reflection is concerned with modern criticism. This criticism must take account of all the evidence, and must not rush to subjective conclusions. There is constantly, as in the present passage, a sufficiency of clues, which may, however, be easily overlooked by those who are not at pains to exercise an unremitting diligence.

MELVILLE SCOTT.

Stafford.

### 1 Corinthians xv. 51.

No one is likely to challenge the general truth of your statement, in the October issue of THE



EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 11), that Dr. Glover's 'classical studies stand him in good stead . . . in the translations that reveal the accurate scholar'; but it may be permissible to call in question the particular instance which you bring forward as an illustration of this: 'We shall not all sleep, *i.e.* we shall none of us sleep.'

Does it seem likely, on the face of it, that the Apostle, who had said a little before (11<sup>30</sup>), 'some fall asleep,' would venture to assert dogmatically that no more deaths would occur among the Christians at Corinth? Is it possible that he could have been so rash as to make such a statement, without qualification, however near at hand he might believe the Lord's Advent to be? I, for one, think not; and if the interpretation advocated many years ago by Meyer, and adopted by Dr. Glover, were the only one that the Greek will bear, I would unhesitatingly reject that Greek as a primitive corruption.

The English Revisers, although urged by the American Committee to relegate the A.V. 'We shall not all sleep' to the margin and to adopt 'We all shall not sleep' in the text, refused even to give the latter a place in the margin; and their verdict is endorsed by the best English scholarship of the last half-century. Canon Evans, writing a year or more before the R.V. was published, remarks that the objections to the A.V. rendering cannot be sustained; that πάντες οὐ here must be rendered precisely as if it were οὐ πάντες—the structure of the sentence demanding it, and the absence or presence of μέν making no difference. Westcott and Hort (1881) suggest that the position of οὐ after πάντες has probably a corrective force: 'We all—I say not, shall sleep, but we shall all be changed.' Principal Edwards (1885) maintains that if the Apostle had said οὐ πάντες κοιμηθήσόμεθα the words might have implied that, though all will not sleep, some will. But the uncertainty as to the time when Christ would appear rendered it necessary to avoid asserting, even by implication, that some would not remain till the Second Coming. Bishop Ellicott (1887) observes that the Apostle might have expressed the same sentiment by converting the first member into a concessive clause—'We shall all be changed, even though we shall not all pass through death'; but the force of the passage would have

been impaired, and the substance of the μυστήριον less sharply presented to the reader. He thinks that the distinct emphasis on the πάντες alleviates, if it does not wholly remove, the over-pressed grammatical difficulty. Dr. Alfred Plummer (1911) points out that the desired antithesis requires that both clauses should begin with πάντες: hence πάντες οὐ, not οὐ πάντες, in the first clause. Of course, he adds, St. Paul does not mean that all will escape death, any more than πάντας δὲ οὐ μὴ ἴδῃς (Nu 23<sup>13</sup>) means 'Thou shalt not see any of them.'

A few variations of rendering—all, however, in harmony with that of A.V. and R.V.—may be appended. 'Not all of us shall fall asleep; all of us, however, shall be changed' (Canon Evans). 'We shall not, all of us, fall asleep, but we shall all be changed' (Canon W. Kay). 'We shall not all die, but we shall all be changed' (Dr. W. G. Rutherford). 'We shall not all sleep in death, but we shall all be transformed' (Dr. G. G. Findlay).

J. H. BURN.

*Whatfield Rectory, Ipswich.*

## Matthew x. 23.

'Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.'

THIS verse is said to be the pivot upon which the eschatological school of New Testament criticism turns. The words are taken to be a promise of the immediate 'coming of the Son of man.' But surely this is to make the axle go round the wheel. The *fixed* date is the 'coming of the Son of man': it is the duration of the mission that is being defined by it—not the converse. 'Till the Son of man be come' means no more than 'until the heavens be no more,' in Job 14<sup>12</sup>. All the verse says is that to go through the cities of Israel would be a long business, if it ever came to an end at all. There may be some hyperbole, as in Ps 72<sup>7</sup>, 'In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth'; and elsewhere. Similar phrases are found in Arabic: 'I will not do it until the lizard yearn for the dripping camels'; that is, 'never.'

T. H. WEIR.

*Glasgow College.*



## Entre Nous.

### TWO TEXTS.

#### 2 Cor. v. 1.

'We left Nakhl at 7.30 this morning with our new escort. It is always confusing to make a fresh start, for the baggage has to be distributed among the camels, and the cameleers have to be instructed. But it was an entertaining delay. The whole population, women excepted, turned out to stare and squatted close beside us, as the "house of our tabernacle was dissolved." Do you know that those words mean literally "the dwelling of this tent is undone or unfastened," and do you remember that St. Paul was a tentmaker?'<sup>1</sup>

#### Matt. v. 8.

'You need the key to everything. We make our own world by the heart we carry through it. A man with a guilty conscience finds the light of a stern judgment in the dawn that guides a happy traveller upon his way. You have got to be in the right attitude, says Jesus, if you are going to see God. It is like looking at a stained-glass window. If you would see its beauty and read its message you have to be within. Outside it is only a dark blur. But stand within, where the light falls through it, and the dull glass blazes into a message and a picture. So it is with God. Find the right standpoint. See life with His light shining through it. For every bit of its texture has some imprisoned message which His light can set free, if only you have the eyes to see it. And *this* is the right spirit, the true attitude—to be pure in heart.'<sup>2</sup>

### SOME TOPICS.

#### The Christian Life.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton are issuing a series of small books with the appropriate title 'Little Books on the Christian Life' (3s. 6d. net each). If we mistake not, the series was projected by the late Rev. J. M. E. Ross, and to our mind it has still in some intangible way the stamp of his personality. 'The Christian Life,' the preface says, 'is a many-sided thing, as many-sided as life itself, since all life is meant to be Christian. It includes belief

and conduct; experience and hope; prayer and service; church and home and daily task; the joy of a divine revelation, and the upward climb of the loftiest ethic the world has ever known!' Six volumes of the series have now been issued, and they are many-sided and wide in their scope. One we have spoken of in these columns already—*As at the First*, by the Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D., a devotional account in Dr. Hutton's own characteristic way of the early Church as seen in the Book of Acts. The latest volume to reach us is one with the enigmatic title *In the Form of a Servant*, by the Rev. Frank H. Ballard, M.A. It is a beautiful commentary on the life of Jesus in some of its aspects. The topics are such as these: The Early Days in Nazareth, The Home, The School, The Carpenter's Shop, The Teacher of Teachers, The Critic (Jesus' judgment on Pharisaism), The Catholic Mind, the Man of Sorrows. No one could read this little book without knowing Jesus better and at the same time gaining a fresh impulse towards discipleship.

The Rev. James Reid, M.A., of Eastbourne, deals with the Beatitudes. *The Key to the Kingdom* he calls the volume. Do the Beatitudes seem far removed from the world and the man in the street? Mr. Reid brings them home to him. Hear him on Christian socialism. 'We sometimes speak of the need of goodwill to reach a settlement. But what we often mean by goodwill is just good temper and a kindly spirit which hates a dispute. Yet to try to bring peace to our social and industrial life simply by kindly sentiment is like trying to kill the poison of a swamp by planting flowers which will disguise the odour, instead of draining the soil. Goodwill, in the meaning of Jesus, is no mere sentiment. It is *good will*—the will set on what is right. It is the spirit that wills good—and that the good of all—not merely selfish personal advantage. It is the spirit which can tolerate no wrong with an easy mind.' The Lord's Prayer—*Our Father*—is dealt with by the Rev. Anthony C. Deane, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Ennismore Gardens. It is interesting to note that the dedication in this volume is 'In Grateful Memory of W. R. N. and J. M. E. R.' Mr. Deane's way of approach is by textual criticism, and a very fruitful way it turns out to be in his hands. One out of the many instances may be

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Times of Alexander Robertson MacEwen, D.D.*, 154.

<sup>2</sup> J. Reid, *The Key to the Kingdom*, 159.



given. He takes the words 'Give us to-day our daily bread' and, interpreting them as most modern scholars do, 'Give us to-day our to-morrow's bread,' finds that the old thought, though still retained in its fullness, has become subsidiary to the new. 'In its chief significance the prayer becomes one less for food than for peace of mind. The reason of our asking for the food is that we may be freed from anxiety. "Give us—not accumulated wealth, not heaped-up stores for all the days to come—we do not ask for that—but give us sufficient simple provender in hand that our lives may not be marred by over-anxiety about the morrow. Give us to-day to-morrow's bread."'" The two remaining volumes are *The Guests of God*, by Dr. George Jackson, a volume of very suggestive studies for the Communion season; and *The Christian Optimist*, by the Rev. James Colville, M.A. Its divisions are: The Belief of the Christian Optimist, The Triumph of the Christian Optimist, and The Service of the Christian Optimist. The treatment in all these volumes is devotional, but there is much knowledge behind it, and the reflections are illuminated by many illustrations from life and literature.

#### Father and Son.

'I can't tell you how truly I love you, and I want you to be told I do before you know all about your prizes. I think you have done very well in your whole Academy course which is now so near its end. You may not get all you hoped for this last year. I know you miss the English Medal, but if you had got it, you might have been led to think more of yourself than was right. Don't grudge it then to the boy who has got it. Many others will be disappointed too, and you get tokens enough without it of your success and distinction as a scholar. I had sometimes a sore heart, too, at prize time. Keep this aim before you always, to grow in qualities that are good whether they are rewarded at the time or not. Their fruit always comes at last. You have given me almost no trouble hitherto as your trainer. As for me, I had nobody to talk with and cling to as a man when I was a child, and I have suffered for it in many ways. You know I have tried to be to you what I yearned for in my boyhood. So, my dear boy, let nothing ever keep you from trusting me. Ask me anything. Tell me of any scrape or temptation you may meet as you grow older, and be sure that you will get good in this way, which nothing else can possibly

give you. Yes, there is something else better still, and that is learning to trust a better Father. Don't give up His Book, a verse or two of it morning and night, and prayer, not too long, but real and earnest. Now I'll not write you often like this; perhaps never again. It is likely you will be living long after I am dead, and be the only near friend your sisters will have, and I would so like you to be to them and every one such a man that others would say, "The father of Alexander would be a happy man if he could see what his son has become," and, perhaps, I shall see it, too.'<sup>1</sup>

#### NEW POETRY.

##### Godfrey Elton.

The proportion of verse to poetry is high, and so we welcome all the more greatly Mr. Godfrey Elton's *Years of Peace* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). The poems in this volume reflect the varying moods of a man who fought in the Great War and from whose mind the thought of the comrades who did not return is never far absent although he is himself enjoying the tender years of early married life. Very typical of one phase of his thought is 'The War Memorial':

'The very thing we want' (said Brown),  
'To make memorial for the dead,  
Is something Useful for the Town.  
Some cosy reading-room?' (Brown said).  
Jones seconded, obese and wise;  
Slow-wagging forefinger, slow-blinking eyes.  
He coughed, empurpled; hoiked at phlegm.  
Ladies in furs and pink old boys  
All made an acquiescent noise. . . .  
Tears filled my eyes, all scalding. I'd seen *them*,  
Fair, doomed, unheeding . . . David . . . yellow  
broom. . . .  
And suddenly I shouldered out of the room,  
Left them all gaping.

The best poem is probably 'Pity the Wise,' but unfortunately it is too long to quote, so we give instead 'Passers By,' which also shows the author in typical mood—impatient of the coldness and reserve of the day:

I have loved people who did not love me.  
Why was it I never said,  
'Time is illusion, surely here and now  
We can create eternity, you and I'?

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Dr. MacEwen to his son, A. R. MacEwen, in 1866.



Oh, why?  
 Instead,  
 'The Times,' said I, 'is very dull to-day.'  
 And they agreed politely and went their way.  
 People have loved me whom I did not love.  
 And did they ever say,  
 'Maybe you will not pass again this way,  
 Oh, be with us a season ere you go,  
 For in a little while we shall be dead'?  
 Oh, no.  
 They said,  
 'Isn't it shocking weather for July?'  
 I answered, 'Yes, indeed,' and passed them by.

#### Fred Merrifield.

There are two things essential to a good anthology, arrangement and selection. Mr. Merrifield in his anthology of *Modern Religious Verse and Prose* (Scribners; \$3.50) has studied both. He has grouped his poems under such general headings as 'The Divine Possibilities of Man,' 'Service and World Brotherhood,' 'Co-operation with God,' and 'The Spirit of True Worship.' On each division there is a note showing the development of thought. The selection also is good, for while many of the poems are familiar, there is a considerable proportion by younger American authors whose work will be found fresh. The first poem quoted is by Mr. Louis Untermeyer, and the second by Mr. Charles M. Sheldon:

#### HOW MUCH OF GODHOOD.

How much of Godhood did it take—

What purging epochs had to pass,  
 Ere I was fit for leaf and lake  
 And worthy of the patient grass?

What mighty travails must have been,  
 What ages must have moulded me,  
 Ere I was raised and made akin  
 To dawn, the daisy and the sea.

In what great struggles was I felled,  
 In what old lives I labored long,  
 Ere I was given a world that held  
 A meadow, butterflies, and song?

But oh, what cleansings and what fears,  
 What countless raisings from the dead,  
 Ere I could see Her, touched with tears,  
 Pillow the little weary head.

#### JESUS THE CARPENTER.

If I could hold within my hand  
 The hammer Jesus swung,  
 Not all the gold in all the land,  
 Nor jewels countless as the sand,  
 All in the balance flung,  
 Could weigh the value of that thing  
 Round which his fingers once did cling.

If I could have the table he  
 Once made in Nazareth,  
 Not all the pearls in all the sea,  
 Nor crowns of kings, or kings to be,  
 As long as men have breath,  
 Could buy that thing of wood he made—  
 The Lord of Lords who learned a trade.

Yes, but his hammer still is shown  
 By honest hands that toil,  
 And round his table men sit down,  
 And all are equals, with a crown  
 No gold nor pearls can soil.  
 The shop at Nazareth was bare,  
 But Brotherhood was builded there.

#### Studdert-Kennedy.

Get a copy of 'Some Less Rough Rhymes of a Padre.' It is Mr. Studdert-Kennedy's latest little volume, to which he gives the title *Lighten Our Darkness* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net):

#### HE WAS A GAMBLER TOO . . .

And, sitting down, they watched Him there,  
 The soldiers did;  
 There, while they played with dice,  
 He made His Sacrifice,  
 And died upon the Cross to rid  
 God's world of sin.  
 He was a gambler too, my Christ,  
 He took His life and threw  
 It for a world redeemed.  
 And ere His agony was done,  
 Before the westerling sun went down,  
 Crowning that day with its crimson crown,  
 He knew that He had won.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
 and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
 Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.